HD
Class No. 6338 Book No. D29

LIBRARY OF THE

MEADVILLE
THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

ROBERT COLLYER FUND

66394

Lester Leake Riley

My City
Douglastown
October 1929

LABOR SPEAKS FOR ITSELF ON RELIGION

OTHER BOOKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

Business and the Church
Christianity and Social Adventuring

LABOR SPEAKS FOR ITSELF ON RELIGION

A Symposium of Labor Leaders Throughout the World

Edited and with an Introduction

BY

JEROME DAVIS

YALE UNIVERSITY

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1929

COPYRIGHT, 1929,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and printed.
Published June, 1929.

All rights reserved, including the right of reproduction
in whole or in part in any form.

66394

SET UP BY BROWN BROTHERS LINOTYPERS
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE CORNWALL PRESS, INC.

TO THE SINCERE LABOR LEADERS OF EVERY NATION WHOSE LIVES OF SERVICE AND SACRIFICE HAVE HELPED TO ELEVATE THE WORKING CLASS. IN AIDING LABOR THEY HAVE BEEN FOLLOWERS OF THE CARPENTER OF NAZARETH

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/laborspeaksforit0000jero

INTRODUCTION

For centuries ministers, politicians, and captains of industry have been telling labor what it ought and ought not to do. There have been scores of volumes written by professors, correspondents and corporation executives about "What's on the Mind of the Worker," "What the Workers Want," and "The Psychology of Labor." Every year the Social Service Commission of the Federal Council of Churches issues a Labor Day message. Is it not unfortunate that we do not have an annual declaration from the heart of labor to the church? Scores of sermons have been written and countless statements have been made about the extent to which labor supports the church. Most of them have been mere speculation. We do not know. Is it not about time for labor to have its own day in court and tell frankly what it thinks about the church?

The following book is the voice of labor speaking for itself. Here for the first time we have a compilation from labor leaders all over the world stating frankly their opinion about religion. In many cases we have left the manuscripts just as they came to us, even including ungrammatical phrases. No matter what one's own attitude toward religion may be, he is likely to be shocked by some of the unconventional attitudes herein expressed. The reader, however, should remember that this is a case record of attitudes. The mere inclusion of an attitude does not mean that it is right or wrong. No matter how violently one may be opposed to some contribution, the significant thing is that certain

individuals hold that opinion. If the contribution had not been printed, the point of view would still have been the philosophy of certain human beings, but fewer people would have known that it was so held.

A serious lack in many religious leaders is their failure to welcome sincere criticism leveled at the church. The highest consecration demands that we give a sympathetic hearing to every honest criticism. At the very least it should help the church to understand the attitudes of men; at its best it should be an aid to the revaluation of values and their application to life.

Some will want to know the reason for the omission of certain leaders. In the first place, it is impossible to include everyone. Inclusion involves exclusion. In the second place, some of those invited did not wish to contribute. They frankly stated that it would cause serious difficulties in their own organizations if they published their attitudes on religion; for included within their membership are those who hold widely varying views. Beyond this fact lies the difficulty of securing contributors, which is obviously very great in a group which has come up from the ranks and has never had much formal education. Labor leaders are more used to doing manual work such as mining coal, for instance, than writing books. It is far easier to induce them to speak at a church meeting than to write about the church.

Others will feel that we have neglected particular countries. This is true. America has been represented far beyond its equitable proportion. England, Germany and certain other nations have been relatively slighted. Since the book will be circulated primarily in America, one reason for this is obvious. A more important factor was the difficulty in securing chapters from abroad. The editor secured the article from Arthur Henderson

by personally seeing him in England, but with many others this was impossible. Moreover, the requirements of the publishers as to space prohibited further enlargement.

The editor tried to eliminate bias in the selection of the contributors by taking men who held the most important executive positions in the labor field in each country. President Green was asked to select the representatives of the American Federation of Labor who should contribute and, of the chapters from the United States, his has the final place. In England Ramsay MacDonald, although not himself contributing, suggested the writers. Although the Italian Confederation of Fascist Trade Unions was written to, no contribution has been received. The French labor leaders were unwilling to contribute. In arranging the order of the contributors the editor has placed the United States, Canada and England first because of the immediate audience to which the volume is directed. The remaining chapters are arranged in accordance with the strength of the organized labor movement in the countries from which they come. The numbers enrolled in the organized labor movement in the various countries represented in this volume are as follows: [1]

United States of America [2] ...	3,500,000
Canada	103,037
Great Britain	4,365,619
Russia [3]	10,250,200
Germany	4,786,282
Mexico	2,000,000

[1] Unless otherwise stated, the figures are from the *American Labor Year Book* for 1927. The ranking is according to the order in which the chapters from these countries appear in this book.

[2] *American Labor Year Book,* 1928, p. 105.

[3] *Soviet Russia in the Second Decade,* New York, The John Day Co., 1928, p. 191.

Czechoslovakia	1,669,000
China	1,240,000
Austria	1,044,000
Australia	795,722
Belgium	552,094
Japan [4]	292,335

The editor makes no pretense that this book is a scientific representation of the attitude of the majority of the laboring class, but he has tried to secure representative leaders and has urged them to express frankly their own attitudes. To what extent the opinions represent the rank and file would be difficult to estimate, but we feel that we have charted more or less accurately the attitudes of thousands upon thousands of laboring men throughout the world.

No serious searcher after truth will oppose a volume which seeks to portray accurately and sincerely the attitudes of representative labor leaders throughout the world, nor, we think, will anyone who really loves his fellow men.

The editor believes that it would be a tremendous stimulus to real religion if these opinions could be read by every sincere believer. They have lessons for all of us. The honest Christian should be most grateful for those chapters which are most critical. They might help him to understand where Christians have failed of their high calling. We must all remember that Christ did not oppose men who were sincere and were daily sacrificing their all for what they believed to be the truth. His greatest criticisms were hurled against the comfortable and the hypocrites. Every reader must ask himself: "Is labor justified in the attitude which it has taken towards the church? To

[4] For June 1927 from the Labor Office of the League of Nations.

what extent is their indictment true? How can we secure coöperation on the part of these men in a task that involves us all? What part should the church and religion play in helping the laboring masses?"

To bridge the gap between the church and organized labor in America the editor intends to start in the near future a Religion and Labor Bureau, which shall be non-denominational and non-sectarian, and which will include both church and labor leaders on its board. He would be glad to hear from all those who are interested. Any royalties from this book will be devoted to the cause of labor.

The editor desires to express his deep appreciation of those who have contributed to this symposium. We are all under obligation to the workers whose labor has made possible publication.

THE EDITOR

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION BY THE EDITOR 7

I.

A CLASS CHURCH AND A CHURCHLESS CLASS . . . 19
JEROME DAVIS

II. THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

HAS THE CHURCH BETRAYED LABOR? 29
JAMES H. MAURER, President, Pennsylvania Federation of Labor

WORK IS WORSHIP 37
ANDREW FURUSETH, President, International Seaman's Union of America

THE RELIGION OF LABOR 44
J. B. S. HARDMAN, Editor of *The Advance,* official organ of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers

RELIGION IS THE NEGATION OF TRUTH 54
JAMES P. THOMPSON, National Organizer of the I. W. W.

CAN THE CHURCH BE LED BACK TO THE HUMBLE CARPENTER OF NAZARETH? 62
DANIEL TOBIN, President, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen and Helpers of America, and Treasurer, American Federation of Labor

ORGANIZED LABOR AND THE CHURCH 67
THOMAS F. MCMAHON, President, United Textile Workers of America

NEGRO LABOR AND THE CHURCH 74
A. PHILIP RANDOLPH, General Organizer, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters

PAGE

THE CHURCH 84
JAMES P. NOONAN, President, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and Vice President, American Federation of Labor

WHAT THE CHURCH NEEDS TO BE SAVED 88
ARTHUR O. WHARTON, President, International Association of Machinists

QUESTIONS FROM THE LEFT 97
ABRAHAM J. MUSTE, President, Brookwood Labor College

AMERICAN LABOR AND THE CHURCH 108
WILLIAM GREEN, President, American Federation of Labor

MY EXPERIENCE WITH THE CHURCH 115
JAMES S. WOODSWORTH, Labor Member of Parliament

A LABOR CRITIQUE OF THE CHURCH 129
JAMES SIMPSON, Secretary, Canadian Labor Party

III. GREAT BRITAIN

BRITISH LABOR AND RELIGION 140
RT. HON. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P., Secretary, British Labor Party, Home Secretary in the first Labor Government

BRITISH SOCIALISTS AND THE CHURCH 151
A. FENNER BROCKWAY, Editor of *The New Leader*, and Secretary of the Independent Labor Party

LABOR THINKS LITTLE OF THE CHURCH 153
GEORGE LANSBURY, M.P., Labor Member of Parliament

IV. RUSSIA

BOURGEOIS AND COMMUNIST MORALITY 163
VLADIMIR LENIN

THE SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODS OF ANTI-RELIGIOUS PROPAGANDA 170
LEON TROTZKY

PAGE

THE RÔLE OF EDUCATION IN THE STRUGGLE WITH RELIGION 177
ANATOL VASSILIEVITCH LUNACHARSKY, People's Commissar of Education

THE NECESSITY FOR ANTI-RELIGIOUS PROPAGANDA . 185
EMELIYAN YAROSLAVSKY, Associate Secretary, Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of Russia

V. GERMANY

RELIGION A PRIVATE MATTER 191
ARTHUR CRISPIEN

RELIGIOUS NEUTRALITY 196
BERNHARD GOERING

AT THE THRESHOLD OF A NEW RELIGIOUS EPOCH . . 200
KARL MENNICKE

VI. CZECHOSLOVAKIA

LABOR AND THE CHURCH IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA . . 209
EMANUEL RADL

VII. MEXICO

LABOR AND CHURCH IN MEXICO 217
ROBERTO HABERMAN, General Delegate of the Mexican Federation of Labor in the United States

VIII. CHINA

LABOR AND CHURCH IN CHINA TO-DAY 231
GIDEON CHEN, Industrial Work Secretary, National Christian Council

IX. AUSTRIA

LABOR IS INDIFFERENT 238
KARL KAUTSKY, author of numerous important books on Socialism and Labor

PAGE

THE SOCIALIST ATTITUDE TOWARD THE CHURCH . . 240
OTTO BAUER

X. AUSTRALIA

THE CHURCH IS WEIGHED AND FOUND WANTING . 244
ERNEST H. BARKER, General Secretary, Australian Labor Party

XI. BELGIUM

SOCIALISTS AND RELIGION 251
EMILE VANDERVELDE, formerly Labor Minister of Foreign Affairs and member of the Belgian Parliament

XII. JAPAN

RELIGION AND ECONOMICS 259
TOYOHIKO KAGAWA, Secretary, Japan Labor Federation

For letter of Mahatma Gandhi of India, see p. 26.

LABOR SPEAKS FOR ITSELF ON RELIGION

LABOR SPEAKS FOR ITSELF ON RELIGION

A CLASS CHURCH AND A CHURCHLESS CLASS

JEROME DAVIS

Jerome Davis was born in Japan, of American parents. His father, after having a share in freeing the slaves as a colonel in the Civil War, helped to found the largest Christian university in Japan, Doshisha. His mother, Frances Hooper Davis, traced her ancestry back through a governor of Massachusetts to a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

In spite of the handicap of a foreign schooling, Jerome Davis finished his college course at Oberlin in three years. For a short time he worked with the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, and then began his training for the ministry. During the summer he toured Labrador and Newfoundland with Sir Wilfred Grenfell in the hospital ship *Strathcona.*

For three years during the war, Mr. Davis was in Russia, first in charge of 150,000 prisoners in Turkestan, and later in charge of the Y. M. C. A. war work. At the end of the world conflict he returned to America, speaking widely against Russian intervention.

On concluding his course at Union Theological Seminary he was awarded the Gilder Fellowship at Columbia University and thus had the opportunity to secure his Ph. D. In 1921 he again visited Russia on an emergency relief mission, returning in the autumn to take up his duties at Dartmouth as assistant professor of sociology. In 1923 he made an investigation into the human side of mining conditions in West Virginia for a report which was presented to the Federal Coal Commission. In 1924 he was called to teach in Yale University. In 1926 he was again in Russia, making an investigation for a group of American business men and writing articles for syndication in the United States. In 1927 he went into Russia with Mr. E. A. Filene of Boston and other business leaders, and also acted as technical adviser for a labor delegation. At New Haven he has helped to establish a forum for the labor unions, besides assisting in other educational work for labor.

Mr. Davis is the author, or editor, of *The Russians and Ruthenians*

in America, The Russian Immigrant, Business and the Church, Christianity and Social Adventuring, Introduction to Sociology, Readings in Sociology, the *Social Relations Series,* and contributing editor of *Social Forces.*

THE outlook of labor toward religion is important far beyond this single problem, basic as it is. It should give a flash of subtle underlying weaknesses in our social structure. For the attitude of any large group in our civilization reflects fundamental aspects of our practical way of life. What are the causes back of the mental pictures labor has formed about our religious institutions? Consider whether the workingman's reaction toward the contemporary church is not bound up with the larger burning question of property rights and class prerogatives.

One hears the question sometimes raised: "What is the most insidious evil threatening civilization to-day?" Many world leaders have answered: "Bolshevism's propaganda for world revolution." But the gravest dangers usually arise from within. No society free from a rotten and decaying foundation will ever join in world revolution. Is not a far more serious and insidious threat to our freedom materialistic autocracy and is this not one reason for labor's attitude toward religion?

We talk glibly of democracy: we seldom analyze to determine how far all the institutions of society are democratic. Take America, for instance, a land of three million square miles, with a population of 106 million (1920), increasing each year by about one and a half million. Already the number of those working in manufacturing exceeds those in agriculture. We have become an industrial nation. There are those who would say that these labor masses toil under industrial autocracy. A man may have given the best thirty

years of his life in the mines or in steel, but he can be discharged at a moment's notice at the mere whim of his superior. He has no legal right to his job. No labor organization is permitted in most concerns, and where the company union exists the trade union is usually not tolerated. Such a state of affairs in any of the professions could not long endure. What would we think of a university which prohibited teachers from belonging to the Association of University Professors, or a manufacturing concern which refused to let its legal staff affiliate with the American Bar Association? To be sure, these organizations are respectable, they do not lead strikes, but should not a worker have the same right as the lawyer or teacher to belong to an association of his own choice? Certain it is that, secretly or openly, many concerns now refuse to permit large numbers of their workers to affiliate with the American Federation of Labor. Russia prides herself on a "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." Industrial America is ruled in part by the captains of finance and industry, almost an autocracy of dictators, benevolent or otherwise. Says the Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations of the United States Government: [1]

> It has been shown that the great fortunes of those who have profited by the enormous expansion of American industry have already passed, or will pass in a few years, by right of inheritance to the control of heirs or to trustees who act as their "vice regents." They are frequently styled by our newspapers "monarchs of industry," and indeed occupy within our Republic a position almost exactly analogous to that of feudal lords.
>
> These heirs, owners only by virtue of the accident of

[1] Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, Washington, D. C., 1915, p. 30.

birth, control the livelihood and have the power to dictate the happiness of more human beings than populated England in the Middle Ages. Their principalities, it is true, are scattered and, through the medium of stock-ownership, shared in part with others; but they are none the less real. In fact, such scattered invisible industrial principalities are a greater menace to the welfare of the Nation than would be equal power consolidated into numerous petty kingdoms in different parts of the country. They might then be visualized and guarded against; now their influence invisibly permeates and controls every phase of life and industry.

"The king can do no wrong" not only because he is above the law, but because every function is performed or responsibility assumed by his ministers and agents. Similarly our Rockefellers, Morgans, Fricks, Vanderbilts and Astors can do no industrial wrong, because all effective action and direct responsibility is shifted from them to the executive officials who manage American industry.

The report of the Industrial Inquiry of the Liberal Party in Great Britain in 1928 portrays the English situation. Work people feel (a) that they are treated rather as tools than as partners in production, and that they do not enjoy in industry a standing corresponding with their standing as free citizens; (b) that the distribution of the wealth they help to create is carried out on principles to which they are not parties, and leads to a cleavage between a small owning and directing class and a large working class.

Only recently the Jacob Wertheim Research Fellowship at Harvard has been devoted to a detailed study of *What the Employer Thinks*. Here are some of the statements about American conditions:

Industry is divided into two armed camps—that of management and that of men.

> The denial of a worker's capacity to feel, think, and grow strikes a severe blow at democratic government and contemporary society. It breaks down a man's spiritual morale.
>
> In many cases workers might be automata for all the recognition given their essential human nature.
>
> Practically no executive avows his obligation for the conscious and definite development of his workers.
>
> So far the Public in opposing autocratic industry has done little more than have a vague resentment against general conditions.

Obviously something is wrong in the field of industrial relations. In such a crucial problem why have not the churches assumed leadership? May it not be part of the subtle psychologic influence of property power? Is it possible that our church leaders are to some extent blinded by current conventional standards? Are they so busy sharing the wealth of the prosperous with others in spiritual quests that they fail to see some areas of desperate social need? Do they to some degree unconsciously exchange the gift of prophecy for yearly budgets and business boards?

Few of us would deny that the churches are noble institutions serving humanity. The Federal Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the Jewish groups, and the various denominations issue social creeds which usually champion industrial democracy. Once the pronouncement is made, little is generally done by the local congregation to make it effective. Inevitably the effort of the foremost national religious leaders tends to be polarized around the upper and middle-class groups who are not vitally concerned about the translation of "social creeds" into the industrial life. Even a Harry Emerson Fosdick, who

has incalculably aided the religious life of America, is so fortunate as to have his seven-million-dollar church erected by a Rockefeller. This does not take away the minister's freedom, but it does prevent his serving primarily a working-class fellowship. Fosdick's church is not built where working men live, and no capitalists have thus far contributed millions for churches devoted predominantly to the service of the labor class. It is generally true that the highest salaries and the largest city pulpits go to those who receive the benediction of the wealthy.

As President Coffin of Union Theological Seminary has well said, we stand in danger of having a class church in America. Sociology teaches us that everyone tends to take over the psychologic outlook of those with whom he usually associates. One of the gravest dangers confronting the church in America is due to its success. It has won money, standing, and the propertied classes. There tends to be a psychologic control by these forces; of course, so subtle as to constitute an unconscious influence. They radiate an optimistic faith in current conventional standards and the minister without realizing the process tends to think and feel with his middle or upper-class parishioners on these matters. After one has dined with the executive officer of a prosperous business and played golf with another, he has too much practical idealism and good taste to do anything shocking. It just is not done. Even when a minister does condemn the vices of the rich, he is quite generally isolated from the actual life experiences of the laboring class. This makes it difficult for him to feel the iniquity of an injunction in a labor dispute, for instance, or the advantages of a dollar and a quarter hourly rate in the

building trade. Materialistic autocracy, through its control of the budget, subtly buys the minister's time and attention and rarely permits his taking an outstanding part in the organized labor movement. This in turn makes the class-conscious worker feel dissatisfied with the church and with religion. An upper-class church results in a churchless class. What is true of the minister is even more true of the average layman: he is so engrossed in the immediate interests of his profession that he can give scant attention to the needs of labor.

Some Christians may feel that the reason many labor leaders look askance at the church is that they are godless. This may be true, but it is rather curious that so large a number of them champion Christ and his message. If they are godless, why do their lives reflect so much of service and sacrifice? Is it not rather true that Christian laymen in factory and mine have failed to sense the full measure of their responsibility to those whose labor has made possible their very success? Is it not true that ministers have been so engrossed in their task of serving the upper and middle classes that they have failed "to go about doing good" for organized labor? There must be some rather deep-seated cause for the attitudes expressed in this volume. Here is labor speaking for itself, and in the by and large it feels that the church has not understood or helped it to secure justice. The majority believe that the church has a capitalistic bias. It is a class institution for the upper and middle classes. Gandhi of India has summarized the feeling of many labor leaders in the following brief letter, which he wrote recently to Dr. Hume, the veteran missionary, from India:

> You ask me to say what Jesus has done for me. In one sentence I can say that I owe much to the Sermon on the Mount. The American missionary (the church) will really do much for India when they identify themselves with the starving millions by taking to khaki and the spinning wheel.

Gandhi wants the church literally to serve the laboring masses. Kagawa, of Japan, says: "Labor considers the church too other-worldly. It thinks it has no concern with the interests of labor; and that the church has lost her aim in this world and is looking up only into heaven. Labor stops thinking about religion and religion stops thinking about labor."

George Lansbury of England writes:

> Ordinary working people in Britain think very little about churches, or about religion. Not that they can be said to be hostile to either, but simply because for huge masses of our people the churches do not exist. Men who from 1914 to 1918 saw the churches of all denominations taking part in recruiting and singing hymns of war and offering prayers to a God of war, revolt against such a travesty of Christ's teaching.

James Maurer, President of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, whose chapter follows this, makes a terrific indictment against the capitalistic and nationalistic bias of the church.

Are Christians to remain content while millions of organized workers throughout the world question whether the church is standing for industrial righteousness?

There are differences in the attitude of labor leaders in the various countries represented. Some are more favorable to the church than others. May it not

perhaps be due to a varied experience with church leaders, to a more or less righteous action pattern on the part of the organized church? In Russia, for instance, the state church supported a corrupt and dying autocracy. Its emphasis was mystical, and devoid of a program for social righteousness. We should expect her labor leaders to be strongly opposed to the church they knew. Actually we find them throwing overboard not only the church but the idea of a God or any religious concept. In England, where some of the labor leaders have come up through the evangelical church, there is strong feeling in support of religion, but a keen realization of the shortcomings of the church on the social front. American labor leaders feel much the same way.

In the past Christians may have had excuse for not linking the attitude of labor leaders toward the church with their own failure to live a social Christianity. We can do so no longer. The following chapters should bring home to all of us that any country, to be Christian, must be democratic in industry as well as in government.

The contribution from each country supplements and reënforces the thesis of this chapter far beyond any philosophical argument. If we are ministers, we must redouble our efforts to help organized labor. If we are employers, we must reorganize our business so as to make it an educational enterprise which shall stimulate first the understanding and then the intelligent participation of every employee in the conduct of the enterprise. If we belong to that nebulous third party in industry, the average man, we can help create a public sentiment which will force employers to democratize their shops. No industrial system can permanently continue if it stultifies its workers. Nor can genuine politi-

cal democracy long endure if it becomes honeycombed by industrial autocracy. Surrounded on every side by a social order which appears respectable and beneficent yet which irresistably keeps pressing on us all non-moral and actually pagan standards, the average individual is likely to suffer from hardening of the moral arteries. One great challenge of our time is that the church may see the necessity of applying the gospel of brotherhood to our entire industrial order.

HAS THE CHURCH BETRAYED LABOR?

JAMES H. MAURER

James H. Maurer, the hearty and genial president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, is well fitted to represent the point of view of labor. Born sixty-four years ago in Reading, Pa., where his father was a shoemaker, at six he was selling newspapers, at eight working on a farm, at ten in a factory, and at fifteen became a machinist's apprentice. He continued his studies as best he could in the scant spare time which the long labor hours of those days left him, and at sixteen had become a radical. He joined the Knights of Labor and eagerly threw himself into all its activities. Since 1899 he has been a member of the United Plumbers and Steam Fitters Union. In the same year he joined the Socialist Labor Party, and in 1901, when a majority broke away and formed the Socialist Party of America, Maurer joined with them. He soon became a leader in labor circles, editing two labor papers, writing pamphlets and magazine articles, and two books, *The Far East* and *The American Cossack*.

In 1910 he entered Pennsylvania state politics and as a member of the state legislature was the first to introduce many labor measures, such as workmen's compensation, old-age assistance, and mothers' pensions, most of which have since become laws.

In 1912 he was elected president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor; in 1927 he was elected president of the City Council in Reading when the Socialists were swept into office. He has served on many public commissions, acting as chairman of the State Old Age Commission in Pennsylvania from 1917 to 1925, as a member of the American Commission on conditions in Ireland, and heading the American Labor delegation which visited Russia in the summer of 1927.

In 1928 he was nominated for vice president on the Socialist presidential ticket.

If the workers had the same faith in the church that they have in the Bible, there would not be half enough churches in the country to hold them. The question may be asked, why less faith in the church than in the Bible, and why the many empty pews? Because the gospel as expounded in the average church offers no encouragement, no helpful message for the many hard-

ships that the worker and his loved ones must contend with in their struggle to live.

A worker living from hand to mouth, and lucky if he is not hopelessly in debt besides, working at trip-hammer speed when he has work, with no security against enforced idleness, sickness and old age, can hardly be expected to become deeply interested in or a very enthusiastic listener to sermons about Lot's disobedient wife, who because she looked back was turned into a pillar of salt. He is far more concerned about his own overworked and perhaps underfed wife who, due to the strain of trying to raise his family on a meager income that permits of no rest or proper medical care, is slowly but surely turning into a corpse.

To hear preachers lament and rave about how so very, very long ago Joseph was sold into slavery for twenty pieces of silver can hardly be expected to arouse interest in the minds of people who know that the church not so many years ago not only condoned, but actually defended chattel slavery. To go to a church and listen to a sermon about the sublimeness of being humble and meek, that no matter how desperate the struggle to live may be one should be contented and not envy the more fortunate, because God in His infinite wisdom has ordained that there shall be rich and poor, and that no matter how heavy one's burdens on this earth one should bear them meekly and look for reward in the world to come and remember that God loves the poor—such sermons naturally sound pleasing to the ears of the wealthy listeners, and the usual reward is a shower of gold and hearty congratulations by the sleek and well-fed members of the congregation. But to an intelligent worker such sermons sound like capitalistic propaganda, upon which he is constantly being fed up

by every labor-exploiting concern in the country, and quite naturally he tries to avoid getting an extra dose of the same kind of buncombe on Sunday.

In churches men have listened for nearly two thousand years to lessons and sermons about the "brotherhood of man," "the forging of swords of war into plowshares of peace," "man is his brother's helper," "peace on earth, good will toward men," "thou shalt not kill." We are taught to say the Lord's Prayer and ask for heaven on earth, and yet at every war opportunity, with a very few noble exceptions, the church, at the command of the war lords, has scrapped its peace sentiments and turned its back to the Prince of Peace and heaven on earth and has shouted itself hoarse for hell on earth. And then the spokesmen of the churches of each nation at war have had the impudence to pray to a just God and ask Him to play favorites, to use His infinite power on their side and join in the mad slaughter of His own beloved children. And those slaughtered are the workers, and their folks at home naturally wonder why the one big international peace organization on earth, the church, at the crack of the war demon's whip, deserts its principles of "Thou shalt not kill" and "Peace on earth," and helps to stampede its followers in the very opposite direction.

In my home city, I have seen its most prominent clergyman display his war spirit in a most violent manner, not only by bloodthirsty expressions from the pulpit in the house of God, but, whenever opportunity afforded, by parading on the highways with a rifle slung across the shoulder. In another city I have seen on the public square a giant head of the Kaiser, and clergymen in their ministerial garb outbidding each other to buy a spike, which they proudly drove into the Kaiser's skull.

The local papers of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, in 1918 devoted more than a column to interviews with the city's clergymen as to what they would do to the Kaiser if he were their prisoner. Some said, "Hang him by the thumbs and let him starve"; others said, "Bury him up to his neck and then place food and water in front of him and let him die with food and water in sight"; others, more bloodthirsty, said, "Hang him by his thumbs and cut pieces of flesh out of his body day after day until he was either dead or until there were no more pieces of flesh to cut out." Of all that expressed themselves only one said, "Judge not and ye shall not be judged." To such savage conduct one might pay little attention if it came from militarists, or an ignorant rabble who were trying to stir up national patriotism, but to have it come from the educated mouthpiece of the church of peace, and in the name of God at that, is more than the average God-loving mind can fathom. Surely under these circumstances we cannot blame the worker if he suspects that many of the clergy, and those who directly or indirectly control them, are either too cowardly to stand loyally by their avowed principles or else are just unadulterated hypocrites.

Not very long ago an attempt was made to have a Federal Child Labor Amendment to the Constitution ratified by the various state legislatures. Did anyone notice any activity on the part of the church to help put the measure over? Yes, a few clergymen like Father Ryan, Rev. Bolger, and several others tried to help. But where one was found to be favorable, a dozen were found to be doing their utmost to defeat the measure, while the overwhelming majority twiddled their thumbs in silence.

In Organized Labor's efforts to have human legislation enacted—such as workmen's compensation laws to take care of the industrial cripples, widows and orphans; mothers' pensions that make it possible for widowed mothers to raise their children in their own homes instead of breaking up the family and sending the children out among strangers or to public institutions; old-age pensions which aimed to decently reward old, worn-out workers, so that in the twilight of their lives they would not have to tramp "over the hills to the poorhouse," and similar humanitarian legislation—may I ask where the church was or what it had to say on these subjects? When these measures were before the public, again we found a few courageous clergymen who had the courage of their convictions to come forward and do their bit. But the big crowd as usual twiddled their thumbs and did nothing.

How often during the lifetime of a worker does he see the pastor of his church or the pastor of any church visit and mingle among the workers in the factories, mills, workshops and mines, to learn at first hand of the many vexed problems with which the toilers must contend? The clergyman does not seem to know that the factory is as close to the church as the church is to the factory, and that there he can do as much good and serve God just as well as he can in his church, and besides learn more about the actual affairs of industry and problems of life in one day than he can in a month sitting in his study reading second-hand opinions of others who may not be any better informed than he is himself.

In the mills, mines and factories he will find among the toilers more of the true spirit of God than he will in many churches, but he cannot hope to understand that spirit by discussing the evils of Sunday baseball, or the

poverty of Job, or the sublimity of being content. No, he must get his head out of the clouds and quit chanting his beautiful yet meaningless phrases, and get both feet on solid rock and talk about modern economic problems with which the workers' very lives are tied up, and of which they should have a better understanding!

A great deal is being said and written in recent years about the tantalizing problem of why the people are leaving the church, and how to get them back again. My own opinion is that the people never left the church, but that many churches have left the people for a snug seat in the clouds of self-righteous contentment, where the lowly Nazarene would most likely get his head cracked by a burly policeman if he attempted to interfere.

Where are the churches with their influence during strike situations when the poor underpaid and overworked toilers are pitting their empty stomachs against the steel vaults of their wealthy employers? Do we hear the church thundering out its disapproval and condemnation against the flagrant use of the un-American and unconstitutional use being made of the Yellow Dog Contract and Labor Injunction? Not so that any worker ever noticed it. Out of all the preachers in Pennsylvania, I know of only ten who ever had the courage to openly condemn the bloodthirsty attacks made by the heavily armed coal and iron police, deputy sheriffs and state police on defenseless men, women and children, and for no other reason than because they are on strike. But someone may say the clergy has no business to meddle in such things; it must assume a neutral position. But that is just where it hurts. The clergy

does take sides sometimes, and in nine cases out of ten, when they do, they can be found on the employers' side. We know of certain preachers who actually visited the homes of strikers and tried to persuade them to betray their obligations and go back to work and thereby help break the strike. Others advised from their pulpits that the strikers return to work and went out of their way to accuse union officials who were leading the strike as an undesirable, bad lot of rascals who should be drummed out of town. Yes, the clergy does quite often take sides in strike situations, and in the overwhelming majority of cases they can be found on the side of the employer and against the worker.

For a good illustration of what the church is sometimes guilty of, let us take a glimpse at what happened in Detroit during the month of October, 1926, when the American Federation of Labor was holding its annual convention there. Nearly every church in Detroit sent invitations to prominent labor officials to speak in their churches before Bible Classes, Sunday schools, and Young Men's Christian Associations. Most of these invitations were accepted by the labor officials, including President Green of the A. F. of L. As soon as the big employers learned about the program they not only frowned upon the idea of allowing their sacred temples to be contaminated with representatives of the working class, but put both feet down as hard as they could on the proposition. Did the clergymen stand firm when men with dollars talked? To their everlasting shame they did not. Ninety-five percent of them bowed to the will of Mammon and the representatives of Labor were barred from the sacred temples erected in the name of God and the lowly Nazarene, proving con-

clusively to the minds of the average citizen who controls the churches and whom they serve.

Small wonder that many workers have a poor opinion of the church and that so many pews are empty.

WORK IS WORSHIP

ANDREW FURUSETH

Andrew Furuseth, President of the International Seaman's Union of America, is a native of Norway, where he was born at Hedemarken, in 1854. Brought up among fishermen and sailors, at nineteen he himself went to sea, and the next seventeen years of his life were spent afloat. His first visit to the United States was in 1880, and when he left the merchant service in 1891, he settled in this country. He made an intensive study of the American Merchant Marine, on which he is recognized as a leading authority, and at the same time became interested in trying to better conditions among the seamen. He is an active member of the International Seaman's Union, of which he was elected president in 1908.

He helped to draft the La Follette Seaman Law, enacted by Congress in 1915, which did much to raise the status of the American sailor and freed him from many burdensome restrictions. The Union under his leadership is now active in advocating the passage of a seaman's compensation law, and the revision of the international seaman's code, which it is claimed fails to preserve freedom for the sailor but ties him to his ship.

INTO a world dedicated to slavery and ruled by force came a teacher, Jesus, who said that he had come to fulfill the law. He insisted that men were created in the image of God the Father of all, who treated all his children alike, to whom there were no slaves, before whom all men were equal; and this Teacher taught men to pray, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

From such sources as I have been able to consult it seems that at the coming of the Nazarene free men constituted about ten percent of the population. Slavery being based upon religious belief, there could be no real change until men again should be made to believe that the power which gave them life also gave them the

right to equality and freedom. The free men's belief was that the slave had no soul to be saved or damned: the slave was to the free men—the masters—what the cattle are to us. To the thousands of slaves that had been born in freedom and to the former members of the *collegiae*, the tidings that all men are created equal was like the sound of running water in the burning desert. They believed; again they had hope; again they felt their divine origin and they could bear all things, suffer all things, and yet be glad. Death, no matter how it came, was a release, and thus began that spiritual rebirth and independence which kept growing until Constantine poured the new wine into the old bottles, destroying the bottles and spoiling the wine. It took some sixteen hundred years of struggle, suffering, and death before it could be officially recognized that men were equal before God or in the religious field. Well had the Master said, "I bring not peace but a sword." What else could he bring into such a world, a world that had to be transformed in order that it might live? The struggle was carried on by religious organizations based upon religious discontent—discontent over the lie under which they were living and which crippled their creative powers, even though they did but faintly realize it—and they were willing to give their all to see it ended. It ended at last, and then the divine idea promptly moved onward to the political field. Men reasoned that, since men are equal before God, why not in the state and before the law? And so the struggle began again. It was now carried on by political organizations based upon political discontent. Again men and women had to die that others might live, and live in harmony with the fundamental truth which they felt as part of their being. Again the struggle was long

and fierce. It was mostly on the mental plane, with sputterings of insurrections or incipient revolutions resulting in imprisonment, confiscations, and death.

Our own America was the first nation to recognize and place in a political document the fundamental truth that men are born equal and are by their Creator endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which is the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In this declaration we adopted a covenant with ourselves under which and by which we are to live and to be judged. While we were reasonably true to it, it was well with us. When we realized that we were untrue and then delayed the correction through sordid considerations, it became ill, and we had to endure penalties which are not yet fully paid.

The period which we call the French Revolution brought the question of equality and freedom to the physical battlefields—domestic and foreign—and while the question was not definitely settled it had to be acknowledged that men are, and of right ought to be, equal in the state and before the law.

The idea of equality and freedom having been officially recognized on the political field, it entered upon the industrial field for the purpose of transforming it into its own image.

As the struggle had on the religious field been conducted by organizations based upon religious discontent, and the struggle on the political field had been conducted by organizations based upon political discontent, so we find the struggle on the industrial field carried on by unions based upon industrial discontent—that is, by trade unions. The discontent is natural and comes as a consequence of the condition of the worker in modern life. The organizations of monster corporations—

supermen—capable of acting at once over an indeterminate area, of being present in many cities and states at the same time, and endowed with practical immortality, are grinding the faces of the workers. They control wages—and this means control of the clothing that wife and children shall wear, of the food they shall eat, of the shelter they shall enjoy, and of the education the children shall be able to obtain. They control the hours of labor, which means that they determine when the father shall be permitted to be with his family. The worker feels himself controlled at his work and often fears to straighten his back. Kingly power touched man in spots and at times. The industrial master controls him at his work, blanketing his creative powers; he watches over him at his home; he follows him to his church and to his benevolent society, and finally forbids him to join with his fellows in any trade union to consult about his grievances with the view of having them redressed. As the king punished or rewarded, so does the industrial master; as the king cajoled or bribed, so the industrial master; as the king sent unyielding men to prison or drove them into exile, so the industrial master, by the use of the blacklist, drives men from their homes and compels them to become wanderers, often under assumed names.

And yet those laborers will organize and, like Parliament, submit petitions for redress of grievances; and when that fails, they, like the people's representatives in Parliament, will endeavor to compel favorable consideration by withholding the supply of labor which the industrial master needs to continue his business. The road to freedom and equality on the industrial field is the same as was the road on the political field. The resistance on the part of the Third Estate will, however,

be fierce and long. The Third Estate has come into power, it has overcome the opposition of the old governing class, and it feels itself to be "the heir of the castle and the guild." Their power is immense. Some of them control the lives of more men, women, and children than did many a monarch in earlier times. They have seized upon and are using the state. They either control or endeavor to control the churches through the pew, the press through advertising patronage or ownership, the colleges and universities through endowments, the legal profession through employments, the schools through the school boards, and they use the great publishing houses to suppress or rewrite the poets of the past.

They are seeking through the use of the equity power and direct or indirect legislation to deprive the workers of the freedom to quit work and the right to practice mutual aid. They are seeking to compel political obedience through the use of their industrial power, and finally they appeal to the young to join in suppressing strikes by a temporary use of even the students at colleges and universities. That these could be used seemed to me to be impossible. Universities and colleges are cultural centers founded in large part for Christian purposes. Here the inheritance of past ages are studied, classified, and digested; here we are to find through study of the past some guide for the future; here are stored the traditions of the people; here the evolution of man and institutions as found in history and in religion should be understood; here the real status of labor should be appreciated; here the *laborare est orare* of the old monks should be realized as true; here the Declaration of Independence should find its defenders; here is the temple for the keeping of the

covenant; and yet from these places come young men who think it their duty to assist the employers—the just or the unjust—to beat their workers into submission when they have gone on strike to obtain some redress of grievance. The thing seems monstrous.

I was born in Europe where the fight was between the old governing class and the Third Estate, and I had never heard of students participating in such struggles except on the side of the workers, and the thing hurt. Some thinking made me understand, of course, that there was no such fight here, that while in Europe, as now here, the vast majority of students were from families connected with the Third Estate, and that while in Europe they felt themselves part of a struggle to obtain power, the same class of young men here felt themselves on the defensive to preserve the power which was being attacked. Then I read the report of a distinguished professor describing the strike-breaker as a hero and I began to understand better; but not to excuse the student strike-breaker. The best that we can do for the strike-breaker, or for the minister who supports him, is to pity his ignorance or his lack of character; but with this pity will be a mixture of contempt. It is for the man who scabs, because of necessity, that there may be unmixed pity. The man who knows, as students or graduates of a college or university must know, and yet who out of sport or class-consciousness acts as a strike-breaker, is a traitor to himself and of course to fundamental Americanism. When in our hour of trial and communing with "the laws of nature and of nature's god" we agreed that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we entered into a covenant with "na-

ture and nature's god" by which as a people we are to live and be judged, and we should realize that, if there be a sin against the Holy Ghost, then the failure to keep this covenant sacred is such sin. The last place out of which desecration might be expected to come ought to be a college or a church, the cultural and the spiritual center of our people. Work is worship—to labor is to pray, because that is to exercise the highest, the divine faculties implanted in us as sons of God. It matters not if the labor be the writing of a thesis or the digging of a ditch; it is the use of the same divine faculty to labor —to create—and upon its proper and free use depends the life of individuals, nations, and races. Those who have been untrue have shared the fate of the tree without fruit; they have passed away because they encumbered the earth. Those who have been true have lived and, according to history and to religious belief, they are to live. Let us try to profit by this lesson and so live that labor shall be free, that it shall come into its own.

THE RELIGION OF LABOR

J. B. S. HARDMAN

The editor of *The Advance*, the official journal of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, was born on August 5, 1882, in Grodno, Russia. After leaving school at the age of fifteen, he spent the next three years as a clerk and later as business manager in a lumber mill and construction company. At nineteen he joined the Social Democratic Party and became active in the revolutionary movement. He studied law at the University of St. Petersburg. He spent fifteen months in the prisons of Vilna, Kalish, Lublin, and Kiev because of his activities on behalf of labor. He was finally exiled from Russia by an "Order-in-Council" and came to the United States in 1909. From 1912 to 1913 he was secretary of the Jewish Federation of the Socialist Party. In 1916 he became editor of the *Naye Welt*, a Yiddish labor weekly. From 1920 to 1924 he was educational director of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; since 1920 he has been editor of their official periodical, *The Advance*. Mr. Hardman is the founder and editor of the *American Labor Monthly* and the editor and co-author of *American Labor Dynamics*.

1. The Working Class

Who or what is labor, is not an irrelevant question to ask in a discussion of Labor and Religion. For even if not as elusive as is the term religion itself, the word labor is likely to imply one thing or another to one man or the other. The following descriptive statements are submitted as approximations to what might be suggested as the meaning of labor.

By a President of the A. F. of L.—Labor is the descriptive name for the four million working men and women represented in the bona fide trade-union movement of the United States. They are grouped according to their trade competence or in allied trades' asso-

ciations. Their objective is to secure recognition in industry, a voice in management, and a living wage for their work. Political recognition through labor's official representatives is another part of labor's program. Organized Labor is a relatively small part of the number of working men and women in the United States, but the organized workers are the one articulate and assertive force and they stand for all labor. We wish to draw all unorganized workers into the trade union movement and secure for them the same privileges that those in the movement have gained through organization.

By the General Secretary of the I. W. W.—The insignificant minority of workers in the craft unions of the A. F. of L. are but the leftover of a vanishing stage in our industrial evolution. They represent the aristocracy of skill, which is becoming less decisive a factor in industry with every day that passes. The social outlook of this aristocracy of skill is limited and their objectives do not exceed what they are sure to secure through begging and bargaining. They do not represent the fighting aspirations of industrial labor. Labor is a larger concept than Organized Labor. It is the working class who will sooner or later take over industry from bankrupt capitalism and save it for the human race through the industrial workers' organization.

By the Man in the Shop.—I don't know what labor means. I am a glass-bottle blower. It is a good trade. I do not, though, propose to stay all my life at it. There is no great fun in working away one's healthy life for a wage with nothing put by for a rainy day, while somebody is getting the best of your labor. Of course, I may not find a way out. This is not labor, it is hell.

By a Social-minded Liberal.—Labor is a part of our

complex social mode of living. Labor is characterized by its special function, the discharge of menial or mental activity, or both. There is no way of drawing a clear line between labor and the other elements of our social structure. Conservatives and radicals alike emphasize the distinctive features of labor. This is a misleading approach to the issue and a mischievous one at that. Labor is a function discharged by man regardless of what the special form of return may be—a wage, a salary, or a dividend. Labor is not an economic class; there is no Chinese wall around it in this country, or there should be none. Labor is only one side of a many-sided and many-faced social entity.

By a Socialist or Communist Candidate for Political Office.—Labor is the common denominator of the class of people who derive their livelihood from selling or renting their brawn or brain power. Labor is the class of the exploited political and industrial working men and women in an order based upon the control of the socially necessary means of production by a small coterie of owners, idle rich, manipulators, and gamblers who maintain themselves in power with the aid of the state, its armed forces, and other coercive organs. Labor is out to transform this anti-social order and replace it by a democracy of producers for use and service, not profit.

It is quite in order that there should be as many appraisals of the term labor as there are social groupings which consider the issue and assume to speak about or for labor. It is equally in order that the working man himself should be little aware of his relation to the whole class. Trade jealousies and competition for the job are of necessity pronounced in a world of rapidly changing technology. People think as they live. The

more limited their personal experience is, the more circumscribed are their generalizations. And so, on the surface of things, we see trades and industries, and labor unions, and socialist parties, and liberal well-wishers of labor, and working men, resenting the notion that they are anything less than free and independent citizens of the community—anything but members of a working class. This, however, is an optical aberration. We are distracted by the single objects in the picture to the point of our failing to see the background, the canvas on which the single images are projected.

American labor has been especially blind on this point. American workers have been blinded by the democratic manner of our political behavior to the point of overlooking fundamental lines and interests. We have iron molders, and machinists, and carpenters, and clothing workers, and miners, and labor officials, and dues-paying rank-and-file all in the "labor field," but hardly anybody seems to be aware of the existence of a working class. By means of a most efficient propaganda from the employers' side, due to the erection of all sorts of intertrade partitions, and with the aid of various bogus "issues," such as prohibition, and racial complexes, and religious lines, and geographical sectionalism, the commanding classes of American society have poisoned the very wells of labor's thought. In achieving this result captains of business and liberal intellectuals and clergymen and "labor lieutenants" have been a harmoniously working team. Propaganda, however, may explain facts away but cannot do away with them. We have not ceased to be a "classified" society just because we didn't know we were. The "working class" is a basic fact in our life even if we still consider the very term a foreign importation.

2. Churches and Religions

Religion undoubtedly has a place in human living. Man is afraid of reality. Fear is the material of which gods in heaven are made. Emotionality, longings, and aspirations are facts as real, if not as hard, as sticks and stones. Most men remain religious even if their mind directs them from rather than toward heaven. But most men are inert and ready to live on ready-made prescripts. And it is upon the demand for standardized recipes of living that the churches of God are erected. Hence the disparity between religion and the church.

Religion may be dynamic. Churches are static. Fear, the source of most religion, and the restless craving for a different life, another feeder of religion, may be turned into wonder, the midwife of intelligence. Dogmatism, upon which churches rest, is productive of intellectual stagnation. The Carpenter of Nazareth was physically destroyed by his opponents in Judea; he was intellectually crucified by His followers wherever Christianity was established. Religion may be an attempt at interpreting the mysterious forces of nature or an attitude toward an ideal. It may be directed heavenward and find refuge in the nebulous beyond; in which case it seeks an escape and is but another addition to the reactionary forces in life. It lulls the social underdog with a sham consolation for the oppression and exploitation which are his lot, and furnishes the exploiter and oppressor with graceful distraction and absolution from his daily practice of meanness. This is the actual basis of church activity to-day. But the religious quest may also be the form of a search magnificent, one which aims at the world in which we live and is directed against the order which we have been accepting all too

long. That quest is not out for an escape from life. It does not attempt to outflank reality. It fronts reality and seeks to mold it by pressure, to transform it through a new concentration and redirection of power. The church of this religious quest may not be built upon the word of God. It surely is not imbedded in the wealth of some man. It is the age-old struggle of men for a growing, ever-expanding life for all men. Labor is itself a religion in this sense—not the dreamy religion of God, but the fighting religion of humanity.

3. The Religion of Labor

Enter the factories, the shops, the mills, the business offices, and look. John A. is an electric welder and a Catholic. Peter M. is a bricklayer and a Calvinist. Meyer C. is an office clerk and a Jew. Jane R. is a seamstress and in and between work hours—a flapper. Her shopmates have just no time left to think of church or God. Most people believe or disbelieve, or are indifferent by accident. That may be an accident of birth, of association, the reading of a book, or—an indisposition to do anything. Inertia is the cause of many affiliations or non-affiliations.

The situation changes when the material end of people's living is considered. For whether John or Peter or Jane or Meyer are aware of it or not, they are tied with one bond—their functional relation to life, their social status as producers for hire.

To find out as much, do something like the following:

Call a number of workers into one place; call them together as workers, not as members of a craft, an industry, or a party; see that they fear no possible harm for the act; let one who knows their life and terms of living talk to them; let him attempt to dissect the very

basis of their daily experience, as workers and men, and relate the essentials of that experience to the panorama of life and living in the community, in the nation, in the world.

And then watch the reactions of every member in the assembly; watch them merge and consolidate into a group; watch them grow into a unit, centered about an idea, the idea of their essential oneness of interest and the singleness of their purpose. The complacency of one, the insensitiveness of the other, the flippant buoyancy of the third, the incipient rotarianism of most just recede as the growing group consciousness raises its head. The amorphous mass becomes an integrated unit under the influence of words. This semi-mystical emergence of the group-sense and urge is based upon very real, telling things. The tangible facts of their daily lives are dealt with and action is called for. They react. There are not enough earnings to live on comfortably, even if by comparison with some unknown foreigners "we" are rich and prosperous. There is that lack of security on the job which makes all claim of freedom a boast and a sham. A stinging realization of inferiority surges forth, that inferiority which no one who is doomed forever to work as another man's hire can eventually escape. For a moment, however fleeting, John and Jane and Meyer and Peter cease to live as distinctive and separate individuals. They are sisters and brothers under the crust of their superficial daily moods and concerns. Their upturned faces, the bright, illumined eyes, that wandering entranced glance are the rough material, the rudiments of which the spirit of crusade is made. The group is born—the group within itself. And if you give it a formulated purpose and call out its dormant desire to react to the environment, you

have the stepping stone, the "move" of the labor movement, an elemental force which goes into the making of revolutions, though not necessarily sufficient unto themselves for their success. That pervading essence of labor, that intangible but hard-to-break tie of labor, is what makes labor a religion, endowed with a sense of oneness, capable of eclipsing, superseding all jealousies, petty interests, egotisms. This is called class-consciousness. It is different from wage-consciousness. It is as transcendental as religious mysticism. It is the faith that moves mountains, yet is capable of being harnessed into regulated, constitutionalized action. This happens when labor fathers the labor movement.

4. From a Workshop to a Temple

The stonecutter who, when asked what he was doing, said that he was building a cathedral was an exceptional, artistically-minded workman. His colleague, who in reply to the same question said, "I am working for seven dollars a day," was rather cynical about his job, but he too was of the minority, who either generalize or analyze their experience. Characteristic of the greater mass was the one who said that he was cutting stones, not only because he was stating an obvious truth, but because he refused to think of a motive behind his work, or of a purpose ahead of him. This is the case of the thirty-eight million wage-earners in the United States and their millions of class-brothers everywhere. They cut stones, or drill holes, or sew buttons, or polish metal, or clean streets, or dig coal. They do a particle of a task, are but very remotely and very invisibly related to a program of action, to a coördinated purpose. They are screws in a machine of which they do not know the direction or even the dimensions. Whatever they may

do in their limited leisure hours is relaxation, or health restoration. The longest hours of their life they spend in remunerative but uninteresting, unexciting, tedious work, tiring, never fascinating or puzzling. For the millions who do the world's work this world is a huge workshop, poorly coördinated, mismanaged, where the objective seems to be work itself rather than production, exertion rather than creative effort.

Against this routined workshop order there is a growing resentment. Few dare speak up their dreams. Only very few see the vision of a new order. These do not tire of carrying bricks, of mixing mortar, of "building a cathedral." These are the pioneers of labor's religion, the builders of the Tower of Labor, its forefront fighters. The religion of labor is a fighting religion.

The labor movement consists of organizations which are not always the dynamic force the pioneers had dreamt they would be. Many labor organizations have grown stale, immobile and are in relation to the ultimate aims of labor what churches are to religion, a check upon flight, an arresting, blocking, impeding influence. George F. Babbitt's numerous first and second cousins hold jobs in the churches of labor, officiate in its shrines. Very many of them could say with their distinguished senior relative:

> —Practically, I've never done a single thing I've wanted to in my whole life! I don't know's I've accomplished anything except just get along. I figure out I've made about a quarter of an inch out of a possible hundred rods. . . .

"Just getting along"—the preachment of wise moderation when daring is most needed—is all too loud in the counsels of labor. Because of these junior Babbitts

the full-dinner-pail philosophy prevails in the house of labor. Taking sides with idealism is systematically decried, so there is stagnation where movement belongs, and division where unity is wanted. Advance of significant living is blockaded. Audacity is wanted in American labor, initiative and unity, the source of real strength, unity of organization and purpose. A house divided against itself will not stand the test of endurance. In the struggle and succession of civilizations labor must make headway or it will be pushed back and forced to the wall. There is no middle way, there is no possible compromise of basic issues. There is no salvation in sterility.

Labor seeks power. It will either realize power or realize that there is no hope. Power in the hands of labor cannot be oppressive. Labor is generous. Labor in power is the promise of abolition of the power of force. Labor, whose only chance in history depends on multitudinous action, is the one hope of the realization of individual freedom.

The religion of labor is godless, for it seeks to restore the divinity of man.

RELIGION IS THE NEGATION OF TRUTH

JAMES P. THOMPSON

James P. Thompson, national organizer for the Industrial Workers of the World, has had an adventurous career. Born in Michigan in 1873, at the age of seventeen he became a marine fireman on the Great Lakes and worked for many years as a longshoreman in Chicago, where he became imbued with the syndicalist doctrines which were then making some headway in the United States.

He was one of the founders of the I. W. W. and author of the preamble of their constitution. He has taken an active part in nearly all the great strikes in the United States in the last thirty years, and was general organizer of the strike in the textile mills in Lawrence, Mass., in 1912.

During the war he was imprisoned along with William D. Haywood and some forty other members of the I. W. W. organization for violation of the espionage act. While in prison he was offered parole on condition that he cease activity in the labor movement, and later on was offered a conditional commutation by President Harding, both of which offers he refused on grounds of principle. He was finally released unconditionally by President Coolidge after having been six years and three months behind the bars.

Mr. Thompson is in constant demand as a speaker and has been on fifteen national lecture tours of the United States.

MAN, living here upon the earth where everything is wonderful, naturally asked himself how it all came to be. He did not know, so he proceeded to explain! He said: "I have intelligence; I know that clouds go by and daylight comes and goes; I know a stone is in my path, at least I do after I have stubbed my toe on it a few times." It dawned upon him as well that he did not know much. He reasoned that there must be a being somewhere that knew more than he did—a higher intelligence—a being that knows all—a supreme being—a

God. He could not see this being around anywhere, so he wisely concluded it was invisible. But he was very curious to know what the invisible one looked like. Modest man soon settled that point. He said, "God looks like me!" "God created man in his own image," says the Bible. The fact seemed to be that man created God in his own image. Had the form of man been like that of a camel, we should have had a humpbacked God. Or had man the form of an elephant, we should likely have heard much about the mighty trunk of God. Man in his imagination not only pictured a God in the image of himself physically, but mentally and morally, too. If man believed in slavery, rest assured his God did also. If he was infamous and savage enough to believe that it was all right, for instance, to kill the father and mother and brothers of a girl and then give the girl to the murderers, his savage mind pictured a God as savage as himself.

In the 31st chapter of Numbers in the Old Testament Moses says: "Have ye saved all the women alive? . . . Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves." And further on in the same chapter it says, "And the persons were sixteen thousand; of which the Lord's tribute was thirty and two persons."

Of course, no God pictured in the imagination of man ever knew any more than the man who made him. Man and his God always agreed on everything. Consider, for instance the geology of Moses and the astronomy of Joshua—neither God nor the prophets corrected them. No God, or saint, or inspired writer ever knew the world was round until Columbus showed them.

Those who pretended to know all about the "next world" knew very little about this. And the "next world," which we hear so much about, was created in the image of this world. There were no harps in heaven before harps were invented on earth. To-day angels must feel out of date up there without the radio! If we have kingdoms on earth, we have kingdoms in heaven. If we have tyrants here, we have tyrants there. Princes here, princes there. An aristocracy here, the elect and chosen few over there. The enslaved here, the damned there. Everything is arranged now! On the last day many shall be called and few shall be chosen. Nearly everyone is going to hell! "Glad tidings of great joy!"

Of all the horrible things pictured by the brain of man, the idea of hell, with its eternal pain, is the most infamous. It pictures God as the everlasting torturer of his own children. No wonder that people, savage enough to believe that, should have tortured and burned at the stake so many thousands of their fellow men. They no doubt reasoned that, since God is to burn the unbelievers forever and ever when he gets them, it would be a Godlike thing to start the fires now.

And so man in his imagination creates the kind of God that suits him best and then uses his God to back him up in everything he does. During the horrible dark ages of blood and tears, the ruling classes, led by their kings, claimed a divine right to rule and rob their fellow men.

Ever since slavery began and society divided into classes, morality has had a class character. Instead of saying, whatever adds to the sum of human happiness is good, and anything that is detrimental to human welfare is bad, they said, whatever is in the interest of the

ruling class is good, and anything that is against the interest of the ruling class is bad. "The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class." And the ideas of every ruling class have ever extended to its heaven and its God. Thus we have had savage Gods, barbarian Gods, feudal Gods, capitalist Gods, all supposed to give support and prestige to the robber classes, blessing and rendering sanctimonious exploitation of man by his fellow men.

By religion is meant the duties that we are supposed to owe to God. Of course it is absurd to suppose that a finite being can do anything to help, or please, or grieve an infinite one, because by no possibility can we do anything but what he knew we would do when he made us. Christians tell us that Jesus knew Peter would deny him before Peter knew it, and knew that Judas would betray him before Judas was born. And so, if any of us are going to hell, God knew when he made us he was making fuel for hell.

One would think that after man had conceived of an infinite God he would be decent enough, sensible enough, have faith enough, to leave it to the all-wise God to do what should be done without any instructions or suggestions from below. To pray to God asking him not to lead us into temptation, or, when our loved ones die, to pray to him to do what is right by them, is all founded upon the absurd idea that an infinite being cannot or will not go straight without instructions or supplications from finite ones. And so with his silly conception of a God in the image of man, having all the characteristics of man, a God that is sometimes sorry and repents, one that is pleased and influenced by cheap praise and prayers and humble worship, man proceeds to build up an organization whose function it is to make a business of

influencing God by trying to please him with praise and worship and thus keep him in good humor, offering suggestions in the form of prayers, et cetera, as to whom and what to bless, and to try to keep him from sending us to hell—although they say he has already decided that on the last day only a few shall be saved.

This organization designed to praise God and help him run the universe is known as the church. The established church has always been on the side of the rich and powerful. Its robed representatives, pretending to be Godlike and favorites of God, having special influence with him, have ever functioned as the moral police agents of the ruling classes. At one time or another they have asked God to bless nearly everything, from the slave driver's lash to murderous wars. Thus they strive to extend the blessings of God to the infamies of man.

To-day under capitalism they teach the working class the doctrine of humility: tell them that if they get a slap on one cheek to turn the other—and "blessed are the poor." They tell us to bear the cross and wear the crown, that we will get back in the next world what is stolen from us in this. In other words, they try to chloroform us with stories of heaven while the robbers plunder the world. For this support the ruling classes donate liberally to the church. The organized robbers and organized beggars support each other.

Sometimes, when a king or president dies, we have a mass demonstration of prayers. At such times the church asks us all to pray. By this they seem to admit that they think it will take a lot of praying to save the souls of some of their heroes.

But in order to increase the productivity of labor, and thus increase the surplus product of their wage-

slaves, the capitalists have encouraged science, and science is exposing the bunk preached by the church.

The theories of an individual regarding a future life and his conceptions of a God change as he changes, but not so with the church. It must stand pat on what it pretends is an inspired version of things. To admit it was wrong yesterday would be to knock over its claims of divine inspiration and weaken its claim to being absolutely right to-day.

They are driven to new interpretations of the Bible. They say that some parts of it mean exactly what they say, while other parts mean exactly what they do not say! Their contortions are amusing, to say the least.

Science has demonstrated that the story of the world having been created in six days a few thousand years ago is not true. At first the priests and preachers took refuge behind the saying that a day is a thousand years with God. But that was not enough. So now they say the days referred to in the Bible story of creation were not ordinary days, but rather extraordinary ones, each representing long periods of time, of thousands or millions of years. They will find it difficult to reconcile that interpretation with the one regarding the sabbath day. The Bible says that God worked six days and rested on the seventh, blessed that day and made it holy, and commanded that man should not work on that day. If the days referred to are very long periods of time, either we have all been breaking the sabbath, or the first sabbath has not yet arrived! When it arrives, if we don't work for a few thousand or million years, we will perish from the earth, or at least there is liable to be a shortage of wine for communions as well as of bibles, churches, and many other things.

We hear silly discussions, sometimes, as to whether a

whale can swallow a man. The Christian piously reads the Old Testament to show that it was not a whale but "a great fish." Then he looks wise, until someone points out that Christ said it was a whale. According to the New Testament, Christ said, "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. xii. 40).

We can all agree, anyway, that it would probably have never happened if the whale had kept his mouth shut.

The phantom-haunted fog of superstition is disappearing before the rising sun. The church tries to stand still, but the world moves on. People in ever-increasing numbers refuse to believe fairy tales of Gods and Devils at war—one sitting on a throne in heaven, the other on a throne in hell.

Civilized man refuses to believe in a savage God and rejects the infamous doctrine that would "fill all the future with the shrieks of the damned."

Most members of the ruling classes pretend to believe for social and business reasons. They are still savage enough to try to change man's hope of immortality into an instrument of plunder, and they will continue to try as long as it pays. It is an age of hypocrisy.

But let us have faith that it is an age that is drawing to a close. Indications all point to better, grander days ahead. Capitalism, the systematic murder and exploitation of one class by another, is only a passing stage in the economic development of mankind. It is the glorious mission of the working class to end exploitation of man by his fellow man.

The ignorant man, the hoe type of worker, is disappearing, and the wage-working class, the proletariat,

is increasing in numbers and importance. The scales are falling from their eyes, and—glory of glories—they are becoming revolutionary! The coming of the proletariat is the coming of the world's real saviors. Their triumph will mean the end of the world's last class struggle.

The old is ever shocked by the new. But you of the old can be no more shocked at us than we are at you. You ask what we of labor think of you? We are horrified—horrified at the unnecessary poverty and misery and slavery in the world, horrified at you and your savage Gods—and we are determined to drive all of you from your thrones.

And when you have gone the truth will have a chance, and peace and love will come and bless the human race.

CAN THE CHURCH BE LED BACK TO THE HUMBLE CARPENTER OF NAZARETH?

DANIEL TOBIN

Daniel Tobin, President of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs, was born in Ireland in 1875, where his father was a storekeeper. When the boy was fifteen the family emigrated to America and settled in Boston. He had already been a wage-earner for several years, and now went to work in a tin shop in Cambridge, at the same time attending classes in the evening. Later on he worked as a street-car employee and finally as a teamster. In 1900 he became a member of the first union of teamsters in Boston, and in 1903 represented them at a national convention. Shortly afterwards he became business representative for his local, and since then has devoted all his time to union work.

In 1907 he was made general president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and for more than twenty years has been reelected unanimously. He has also represented his union continuously in the American Federation of Labor, and in 1917 became treasurer of this latter organization, a position which he still holds.

During the war he aided in various labor adjustments, and in 1919 was a member of President Wilson's Industrial Conference.

He has represented American labor abroad on several occasions—in 1910 as fraternal delegate at the British Trades Union Congress, in 1918 at the International Federation of Trade Unions in Amsterdam; and in 1921 he attended the Pan American Labor conference in Mexico City. In 1926 he was sent to Europe by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and traveled through Italy, France, Austria, Germany, and Switzerland for the purpose of studying conditions. He was in England at the time of the General Strike.

As a labor official, serving continuously for twenty-three years, I have, many times, been dissatisfied with the position of the Church toward labor.

I am a member of the Roman Catholic Church. I endeavor to live as a practical Catholic. Of course I

fully understand, and no one knows better than I do, how inadequate are my efforts. Consequently, the average individual might believe that I would favor or be somewhat prejudiced in favor of the Catholic Church in its position toward labor. On the contrary, I am more dissatisfied with the position of the Catholic Church toward labor than I am with the position of many of the Protestant or non-Catholic churches.

In talking with members of the Catholic clergy they remind me, of course, of the assistance rendered by the Church in centuries past toward the support of the guilds, the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, et cetera, but in our everyday, practical life there is seldom a helpful expression or a word of encouragement for the multitudes in the labor movement who are fighting to better their living conditions; and should some unfortunate out of this multitude commit a crime he is immediately severely censured.

I realize also that men like the Rev. Dr. John A. Ryan and the late Cardinal Gibbons of the Catholic Church have been outspoken in demanding justice for the workers, and especially for their right to organize. They, however, are only individuals, and among the large number of clergymen in the Catholic Church there are but a few who have had the courage to express themselves in favor of the trade union movement, while many of them are totally opposed to organized labor in America.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, on more than one occasion, has rendered splendid assistance to the men of labor and the organized labor movement in general. It is also true that among the large numbers represented by the Federal Council of Churches there are many who are bitter antagonists of

the labor movement—which is, perhaps, no more than could be expected.

The fact that a man may espouse religion as a profession as a clergyman does not of course eliminate the human background of the individual. Thousands of clergymen in both Catholic and Protestant churches are the sons of employers—many of them wealthy—and are reared and educated in an environment of bitter prejudice against labor organizations. The splendid training men receive in preparation for the clergy does not very often help clear away the prejudice engendered in the individual during his early years.

Consequently, we find many labor men and thousands among the rank and file who have no use for clergymen and, as a result, lose their faith and hope in religion because of the attitude of the Church toward the labor organizations of our country; and the same may safely be said relative to the labor movement in other countries.

Personally, I believe absolutely in religion and in the Church. I have been trained in the belief that there is nothing in this present life except that we are birds of passage going through this existence in preparation for a Greater Life.

I realize fully that the expressions of individual clergymen are not always the expressions of the Church; that clergymen, the church, and religion are often entirely distinct and separate, and similar to the individual in the labor movement who commits a crime, because that individual does not represent the labor movement and the millions who are members of organized labor should not be held responsible for his actions and expressions.

I believe absolutely that religion and the Church have,

from a temporal standpoint, helped stabilize civilization, and that the man in the labor movement who endeavors to live up to the teachings of the Church, no matter what church it may be, will find it impossible to go wrong.

I have been an officer in the labor movement for twenty-three years, and many a time during those years when conditions confronting us looked very dark, when I saw thousands of men on strike—many of them starving—when disagreements and discontent prevailed within the organization, when the enemies on the outside were using all their efforts to destroy us, I prayed for light to guide me to do right and my prayers always brought me relief. No one except those who have experienced the feeling of seeing men suffer, silently watching their children suffering and starving, can fully understand the torment of mind that labor officials experience under such conditions. Sometimes under such circumstances, labor officials are driven to the verge of insanity, so the executives without any religion in their hearts, who do not believe in the power of a Supreme Being, are to be pitied, as the load is much heavier for them to bear. Consequently my religious training and my attempt to live as I should, in accordance with the teachings of my Church, has materially aided me, and as the years have rolled by my belief has been strengthened more and more.

I am quite hopeful, as we advance in civilization, that the Church, as a whole, and the clergymen of all churches, will in truth and action become more like the Nazarene, the poor carpenter who lived amongst the workers and suffered the anguish and privations of the toiler, to the end that through the actions and expressions of our clergy the millions of working men who

are becoming weak in their faith and who are, many of them, losing confidence in the Church, may be brought back into the fold, for, again I repeat, life for the human being who has no use for religion or the Church in his make-up is not worth living.

I make this last statement fully realizing and understanding that there are thousands who do not believe in the present-day Church, men who are absolutely honest and sincere and who are good-living citizens.

Yes, I am an absolute believer in the Church, but my personal opinion, judging from my experience in the labor movement, is that because of the expressions, declarations, and actions of our clergymen, the labor movement to-day in America and other countries has very little confidence in the Church.

ORGANIZED LABOR AND THE CHURCH

THOMAS F. McMAHON

Thomas McMahon, President of the United Textile Workers of America, like so many other trade-union leaders a native of Ireland, was born at Ballybay, County Monaghan, in 1870. His father was a flax buyer and able to give his five children a fair education.

In 1885 the boy arrived in Boston, and later removed to Rhode Island, where he entered the woolen mills at Riverport. There, he writes, "I learned to build chains for woolen looms, clean harnesses for woolen looms, as well as to weave and perch cloth." Meanwhile he continued his studies at night school, and becoming interested in the labor movement read vividly everything he could lay hands on about the working class. He joined the Knights of Labor, and was active in a strike at the Jesse Moss mill, with the result that after a stoppage of nearly a year he "returned to work victorious."

During the next years he worked in nearly every branch of the woolen trade—as dyer, bleacher, printer, and finally as folder and inspector of cloth—becoming all the while increasingly active in labor circles. In 1903, with twelve other cloth-folders of East Greenwich, R. I., he was initiated into the United Textile Workers of America, and in the following year was made a member of the International Executive Committee. He now devoted himself altogether to union work, acting first as business agent for the local unions of cloth-folders, and later as an organizer for the United Textile Workers. In 1921, on the death of President Golden, he became president of the Union, a position which he has held ever since.

THE Church as the most authentic and oldest organized expression of the religious life of man, and the trade union as the organized expression of the economic aspirations of wage-earners, stand to-day in society as two of the greatest powers for good that we have. What is their relation one to the other? What does Labor think of the Church, and what does the Church think of Labor?

Let me say at the outset that I believe there would be

no such thing as a trade-union movement if there had not first been a Church. The Church teaches obedience to God first. It teaches man's dependence upon God and the sacredness of human personality. The Church claims jurisdiction over things spiritual and leaves to man things material. It is the material things of this world with which Labor deals. Both the Church and Labor, however, stand squarely for the worth of the individual.

What, then, does the Church think of Labor? Let us turn for a moment to the words of the late Pope Leo XIII. In his Encyclical Letter to Christendom in 1891, he said:

> Religion is a powerful agency in drawing the rich and the bread-winner together, by reminding each class of its duties to the other and especially of the obligation of justice. Religion teaches the laboring man and the artisan to carry out honestly and fairly all equitable agreements freely arranged, to refrain from injuring persons or property, from using violence and creating disorder. It teaches the owner and employer that the laborer is not their bondsman, that they must respect his dignity and worth as a man and as a Christian; that Labor is not a thing to be ashamed of, if we listen to right reason and to Christian philosophy, but is an honorable calling, enabling a man to sustain his life in a way upright and creditable; and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels, as means for making money, or as machines for grinding out work.

Or more recently we may turn to the words of one of the foremost leaders in the Catholic Church, Archbishop Curley of Baltimore, Maryland, in an address on the "Conditions of Labor," in 1922. "In Labor," said the Archbishop, "there is honor, there is dignity,

and no laboring man the world over need hang his head for shame because he is a child of labor." And in another part of the address we find the following: "That working people have a right, of which no State, no Country, can deprive them, of forming organizations or associations or unions as the only adequate means of self-protection." We have here on the best of authority a statement from the Church on the dignity and rights of Labor. But he goes further: "Has the union man a right to strike? What does the Catholic Church say about it? The Catholic Church, speaking through the mouth of Leo XIII, lays down this principle: When there are injustices to be righted, when there is no other means of righting the wrongs, then the laboring man has a right to strike."

What, then, have the great leaders of American Labor said of the Church and of the place of religion in our national life? To the men of Labor it will ever remain a matter of great significance that Samuel Gompers, the foremost leader of American Labor, upon his deathbed uttered as his last words: "God bless our American institutions." Samuel Gompers believed in God. Samuel Gompers believed in Labor. He knew that Labor must have a mouthpiece to be heard and to carry on the things that Labor stands for, and he likewise knew that God had his mouthpiece, the Church, to carry on the things that pertained to God.

When some years before his death Samuel Gompers was asked about the aims of Labor, he replied:

> What does Labor want? It wants the earth and the fullness thereof. There is nothing too precious, there is nothing too lofty, too beautiful, too ennobling, to be within the scope and comprehension of Labor's aspiration and wants. We want more school houses and less jails,

> more books and less arsenals, more learning and less vice, more constant work and less crime, more leisure and less greed, more justice and less revenge—in fact, more of the opportunities to cultivate our better natures, to make manhood more noble, womanhood more beautiful, and childhood more happy and bright.

Who is there who has the welfare of America at heart who would not support these aims of Labor so nobly expressed? Does it not indicate the wide area of common purposes and ideals that both the Church and Labor share? Therein lies the basis for my statement that there would not have been a trade union movement if the Church had not first existed. The Church holds up the ideal; Labor tries to apply it. The Labor Movement is, in a word, the practical application of the principles of brotherhood, service and sacrifice, and justice, which have their sanction in religion.

The men of Labor, as I know them by and large, believe in God. To believe in God and to deny the instrument He made, the Church, is inconsistent. Labor believes that it should have—indeed, it must have—the Church with it in its effort to protect and preserve human values. The Church can be of great aid in giving to the workers an appreciation of the fact that in the Labor Movement they have an aid in a practical way to a betterment of their living conditions. The Church recognizes this fact.

What, then, does Labor think of the Church? Labor would be derelict in its duty if it did not coöperate with the Church's attitude toward working men and women. It should be a coöperation that would leave no doubt of the sincerity of Labor's regard for the work the Church is doing for humanity; for Labor not only respects the Church, it loves and honors the Church. Labor to do

otherwise would mean that it preferred chaos and anarchy to progress and justice. The dignity of Labor must be maintained as a sacred duty by those who speak for it. The rights of millions, nay, the very lives of millions, are dependent upon the policy which Labor pursues. We cannot afford to quibble or procrastinate. We must uphold that which is right and condemn that which is wrong. God proclaimed this as a sacred duty for mankind. The Church, His mouthpiece, carries out this command. Labor acknowledges it.

Labor holds certain inalienable rights—the right to work and the right to withhold its labor. The man who is willing to work but periodically is unable to find it for long intervals of time is a challenge to our intelligence as well as to our Christianity. The right to withhold labor or to strike is at times an inherent human necessity that cannot be taken from it. The Church, God's mouthpiece, has recognized this right, as I have indicated elsewhere in this article. In the face of such understanding support from the Church, it is impossible for Labor to think, let alone act, differently than it does now, and not coöperate in every way possible with the Church for the happiness of mankind.

The fundamental principles, then, that Labor stands for are endorsed and backed by the Church. It is only when Labor fails to live up to its high purposes that the Church disagrees with Labor. This difference or disagreement is right and proper. The Church should ever point to higher things. Labor cannot afford to let its dignity be besmirched by aiding or abetting an act or acts which it knows in its conscience are wrong. Labor can only expect the support of the Church when it boldly and without fear condemns the things that are wrong and upholds with all its power the things which

are right. It is because Labor has stood for right as against wrong, even in the face of great temptations, that the Church is to-day back of it.

It is in part because of the support of public opinion as expressed through the Church that I firmly believe Labor has made such magnificent strides forward. The Church created by God is a power for good and a bulwark against evil. It is against all the things that are evil in our life work to-day that Labor is fighting. Labor, therefore, must think of the Church as its friend if it wishes to prosper and go ahead. The Church recognizing these things in Labor, is not only ready but willing to give it assistance. Labor needs this assistance, and needs it badly, in fighting against the evils which are confronting it to-day.

Labor thinks of the Church also as a dutiful child thinks of its mother. Labor recognizes that the teachings and practices of the Church bring comfort, cheer, and happiness to the firesides of the families of the workers. Without it would be strife, rapine, and murder. Labor chooses the brightness of home life as against the darkness of anarchy. Labor stands foursquare with the Church, and I hope this will always be the case. There can be no straddling. We must be either with the Church or against it. I choose to be with it whole-heartedly and without equivocation. I do not want to condemn the Church because of the acts of some of its representatives any more than we want the cause of Labor to be judged by the acts of some of our representatives. The mind of Labor is ever at work in the interest of the toiler.

Labor has many things to be proud of among its accomplishments. Labor knows that to secure these, great sacrifices have to be made. Labor is militant in

material things. The Church is militant in divine things. Labor's outlook is to improve the material things. The Church's duty, in my opinion, is to improve in a spiritual way the human material that it takes to its fold. Labor fights to keep the child out of the factory, the mill, and the mine in order to give it opportunity to develop physically and mentally. The Church fights for the child to control it spiritually and cultivate its mind for the purpose of bringing a greater happiness into its life. Labor and the church are thus working hand in hand to bring the good life for mankind.

I cannot conceive of a Labor Movement without spiritual foundations and initiative. If there were no such thing as spirituality in Labor I could only picture it in my mind's eye as something spineless, something unreal, unattractive, and without hope. Life indeed would be dark, if this were so. But it is not! Labor has taken to itself, to its very heart, the three cardinal features of religion—Faith, Hope, and Charity. Believing firmly in these attributes of religion as I do, I say with confidence that Labor honors the Church and returns thanks to Jesus Christ, the God-Man, in whose Name all good and enduring work is done.

NEGRO LABOR AND THE CHURCH

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH

The only representative of the Negro race to contribute to this volume was born in 1889 in Crescent City, Florida. In a very literal sense he was a product of the church, for his father was a minister. He early evidenced a passionate desire to learn and finally won admission to the College of the City of New York. He had to earn his way and the only position available was that of elevator operator. Together with Chandler Owen he organized the First Union of Elevator Operators and Starters in New York. By hard outside work he succeeded in completing his college course. He early joined the Socialist Party and became an effective writer of pamphlets such as "Terms of Peace and the Dark Races," "The Truth about Lynching." He has taught at the Rand School of Social Science and lectured widely in forums. He is editor of *The Messenger*, a negro periodical of distinction. His greatest achievement, however, has been as general secretary of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. To him more than any other is due the foundation and success of this union which is doing so much to maintain and improve the position of the porters of America.

THE African Negro Church, like most primitive tribal forms of religious worship, was built around taboos, totems and fetiches. The slave trade tore asunder the socio-religious-political institutional arrangements and transplanted, with the African slave, in the Western world, all of the religious mechanisms the African possessed in his native land.

The early slave religious worship in the Americas, a distinctly New-world environment, was a virtual replica of the African tribal forms. But, naturally, this outward manifestation of religious similarity could not persist. The dominant religion of the New World, Christianity, decreed the doom of African animism.

In the Americas, religious worship in the alleged

civilized form, among the slaves, began in the established white churches. This was the mandate of the slave owners, so as to prevent and render unnecessary clandestine religious gatherings of the slaves, that might have, incidentally, served as convenient occasions for fermenting insurrections against the whites, and plots for escape in the Underground Railroad.

Doubtless, the slave owners' fear of rebellion among the slaves rested on sound grounds; for there had already been twenty-five recorded slave insurrections in the Colonies before the Revolution. The slave régime had been deeply stirred and shaken into a hectic feverish fear of slave uprisings, led by General Gabriel, in 1800; Denmark Vesey, in 1822; and Nat Turner, in 1831. As a precaution against recurrent slave revolts, rigorous and oppressive laws were enacted against the assemblies of slaves, following these efforts of black bondment to secure their freedom.

Although the entrance of a Negro into a wealthy and beautiful temple of religion of white Americans today may severely test and strain their profession of belief in the Christ's ethic, because of the tribal Nordic outcry of superiority against all Alpines, Mediterraneans, Mongoloids and Negroids, the African slave enjoyed the blessings of the Christian doctrine, beside their white masters, in order that they (the slaves) might not engage in mischievous and sinister conspiracy against the holy order of Southern slavery. Thus, the black and white Church were practically one under the slave power.

The formal Negro Church was born as a protest against discrimination in the white church, as was the case with the African Methodist Episcopal Church; or it had been set up by white missionaries, or it was the

result of too large a congregation in the white church, which divided invariably into black and white groups or into separate religious bodies by, for and of Negroes.

The foregoing brief historical account of the Negro Church shows that its background is both proletarian and revolutionary. In the North, it was composed of Negroes escaped from slavery through the Underground Railroad, Negroes who bought their freedom, and Negroes who had been freed by the passage of laws for the abolition of slavery in the Northern Colonies. The Black Church was led by former slave preachers, such as Lott Carey, who organized the African Missionary Society, and Richard Allen, who founded the African Methodist Episcopal Church as a protest against persecution by the whites in their churches. The Negro Church in the North prayed and struggled and fought for freedom of the slaves in the South.

It may not be amiss to observe here, also, that before the Civil War, there were probably not a half dozen Negro churches, if any, in the South. They were banned on the grounds of being places of gatherings of slaves which constituted a menace, unless supervised by whites, to the safety and security of slavery.

The early Negro Church then championed the cause of freedom for the black bondmen. During the Reconstruction period, Negro churches served as centers of agitation for the validation and enforcement of civil and political rights of the freed men, and black religious leaders rang the changes for the political and civil liberty of the black proletariat who constituted practically ninety-nine percent of the Negro population.

But with the coming of freedom, the Negro lost the security of his maintenance in terms of food, clothing

and shelter, which was assured under the slave régime. He must now find employment in which to make wages, with which to purchase food, clothing and shelter, upon which his life depended. His first thought, then, was the getting of a job. The economic reward of the job was a secondary consideration. Next to the question of getting a job, was the matter of preparation for the new demands which were manifesting themselves as a result of the march of the industrialization of the South. That the Negro might not be the flotsam and jetsam of a new industrial era which was rapidly assuming ascendancy in America, as a result of the American industrial revolution. Booker T. Washington, great American educator, conceived the Tuskegee Idea, and sought, with the aid of white philanthropists, to create black artisans, to take their places in the building of industrial America. His was the vision of a prophet. He wrought more nobly and wisely than he knew. But under the stress of the industrial and commercial profit system, which was more and more functioning through gigantic trusts and mergers as a result of the increasing concentration of productive capital into fewer and fewer hands, the Negro, like the white worker, began to realize that in order to sell his labor at a favorable wage level, besides industrial training, he needed economic power, which came only from organization.

Thus, the Negro worker, as a result of economic necessity, began thinking in terms of collective bargaining. During the Reconstruction period, Negro workers had organized a National Negro Labor Union, which unfortunately fell under the leadership of Negroes whose political philosophy took precedence over the economic, and resulted in sacrificing the economic movement to political expediency. Negro

workers had also entered the Knights of Labor, and began joining international unions of the American Federation of Labor, as soon as that body was formed.

While the Negro Church comprehended the struggle of the black workers for jobs and the industrial educational preparation for jobs, it did not readily grasp the nature, scope and meaning of the Negro workers' economic efforts to raise their wages, shorten hours of work, and improve working conditions. Only the job-getting and the industrial training efforts met with no resolute resistance, for white Northern philanthropists had shown themselves greatly favorable to Negro industrial education. Probably one cogent reason for the Negro preachers' indifference and opposition to the organization of Negro workers for economic advantage, in many cases, was that the powerful white capitalists who had sometimes appeared as friendly philanthropists, themselves opposed black wage earners organizing as they opposed the organizing of white wage earners. Moreover, organized labor had become anathema in the eyes of the Negro generally, because of the feeling that Negro workers were discriminated against by white labor unions, both with respect to securing jobs under the control of unions and union cards in order to get union jobs. This feeling among Negroes was not without foundation, for there are several international unions that still prevent Negro workers from joining them. It is well to note in this connection, however, that the American Federation of Labor, as a National Body, in convention after convention, has gone on record as opposed to all forms of discrimination among workers because of color, race, creed or nationality. But, of course, international unions are

autonomous and usually determine their own constitutional policies, which may or may not be favorable to the inclusion of certain race groups in their bodies. This short-sighted policy of some international trade unions will be corrected by the organization of Negro workers, despite discrimination; and the forces of industrial necessity and education will develop in the white workers a recognition of the fact that their interests are common with the black workers and that the salvation of the workers of both races are bound irretrievably together.

The attitude of the Negro Church toward labor may be best viewed concretely in relation to the movement to organize the Pullman porters. Fundamentally, one cannot accurately aver that the Negro Church is either for or against organized labor. Although it is fair to add that it is rare to find a Negro preacher who is committed to the philosophy of labor unionism. Of course, white preachers are not numerous either who can be counted upon to champion the cause of the trade union, although many may express general sympathy with the principle of collective bargaining, which they regard as having sufficient latitude to include company unions, variously known as employee representation plans, works councils, shop committees, industrial democracy parliaments, and congresses. Upon discussing a company union, in contrast to a trade union, with the average preacher, white or colored, one readily discovers, among the large majority, a very definite misunderstanding of the difference between these two economic structures. Negro ministers, as a rule, take it for granted that a company union in which Negro workers are forced to be members, is a form of a beneficent economic philanthropy, which is to be ac-

cepted with gratitude instead of rejected with condemnation.

Because the Negro preachers regarded the industrial paternalism of the Pullman Company, manifested in its Employee Representation Plan and the Pullman Porters Benefit Association, as a generous concession to the race, they viewed the rise of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters in August, 1925, with mingled suspicion, distrust and fear. What is true of the attitude of Negro preachers was characteristic of most Negro leaders toward the porters' union.[1]

One of the outstanding instances of a Negro preacher resisting the corrupting influences of the Pullman Company was the flat refusal of Dr. W. D. Cook, of the Community Church of Chicago, to accept a consideration of five hundred dollars in order to keep the Brotherhood from holding a meeting in its church which had been extensively advertised throughout the city. Dr. Cook attested to the fact that the offer was made him by a prominent Negro business man, who doubtlessly served as a mediator for the Pullman Company.

In Denver, Colorado, Dr. Prince, pastor of one of the large Baptist churches, refused an offer of three hundred dollars to prevent the meeting of the Brother-

[1] The outstanding, independent, progressive, intellectual Negro preachers, however, such as Dr. Mordecai Johnson, President, Howard University; the Reverends A. Clayton Powell, of the Abyssinian Baptist Church; W. P. Hayes, of the Mount Olivet Baptist Church; John G. Robinson, of St. Marks Methodist Episcopal Church; A. C. Garner, of the Grace Congregational Church; William Lloyd Imes, of the St. James Presbyterian Church; George Frazier Miller, of St. Augustine Episcopal Church; Shelton Hale Bishop, St. Philips Episcopal Church, of New York; Dr. Prince of Denver; Dr. W. D. Cook, of the Community Church; Dr. Burton, of Chicago; Dr. Griffith of St. Louis; Dr. Cassius A. Ward, of Ebenezer Baptist Church of Boston, Mass.; and Dr. Francis Grimke, of Washington, have consistently supported the Porters' Union.

hood from being held in his church. He publicly expressed, in a church meeting, his sympathy with the Brotherhood and condemned those who attempted to corrupt him against the porters' cause. In the beginning of the movement, every effort was made to close the doors of churches throughout the country to the porters' fight. In every city, however, the organization was able to secure a large prominent church for its meetings, though sometimes it was necessary to pay fifty dollars therefor. In some instances, the use of the churches was given the union without any cost.

Probably the most notorious instance of Negro preachers taking the side of the Pullman Company against the porters' organization, was the occasion of a conference in Washington which was called ostensibly in the interest of fighting race segregation in the Federal Departments at Washington, by Melvin Chisum, self-styled as an efficiency engineer. This conference was presided over by Bishop A. J. Carey, of the African Methodist Episcopal Church; many of the ministers in his diocese were mobilized by him to attend the conference, the expenses of which, including the cost of transportation to and from the conference, together with hotel bills while at the conference, were defrayed by the Pullman Company through its agent Mr. Chisum. A large number of prominent Negro leaders had been lured into this conference without a complete knowledge of its purpose. The main object was to adopt a resolution endorsing the Pullman Employee Representation Plan, as an expression of the sentiment of the Negro leaders of the country. The assumption was that such a resolution would serve as a condemnation of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and cause a stampede of the porters out of the Union. Of

course, it did not have the desired effect, because most of the prominent men who attended, upon receiving an explanation of the purpose and significance of the conference by the writer, expressed their disavowal of the conference and their lack of sympathy with its program.

Bishop Reverdy C. Ransom, of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, when approached to lend his name and influence to the above-named conference, definitely refused and sharply condemned its purpose. The Brotherhood counts him among its most powerful champions in the ministry.

In several cities Negro ministerial groups have endorsed the union. An effort was made to secure the endorsement of the General Conferenc of the African Methodist Episcopal Church which convened in Chicago, in June, 1928, but to no avail, because of the influence of Bishop A. J. Carey, who dominated the conference.

The Baptist Ministers' Alliance in Chicago, which met in the church of Rev. L. K. Williams, President of the National Baptist Convention, in the Summer of 1926, was reported to have endorsed the Brotherhood through a resolution which, however, could never be secured. No minister who was a part of the meeting in which the resolution was supposed to have been adopted, was ever able to give an explanation of the reason why the said resolution could not be secured, or the fact that the Alliance would not permit the Brotherhood to announce that the Union had been indorsed. One reason advanced for the refusal of the Baptist Alliance to come out for the Brotherhood is that the railroads who are interlocked with the Pullman Company give passes, through the President of the

Baptist Convention, to the preachers, which enable them to travel throughout the country at half-fare rates.

Since the Negro Church is largely composed of Negro workers there is no good reason why it should not express and champion a proletarian philosophy. There are few men of wealth in the Negro race. Those who possess considerable property do not employ large numbers of Negro workers, and hence could have no economic reason for opposing Negro labor organizations that are concerned with increasing the wage income of its members. Such is not the case with the white ministers. They must preach a Christian doctrine which will not offend their rich communicants.

As to the Negro workers' attitude toward the Church, most of them are members of some Church, although they feel that Negro preachers are not so militant for their cause as they should be.

Negro labor leaders are not anti-Church, though they may not be Church members. All of them feel that the Church can be of constructive social, educational and spiritual service to the Negro workers.

If the Church, white or black, is to express the true philosophy of Jesus Christ, Himself a worker, it will not lend itself to the creed of oppressive capitalism which would deny to the servant his just hire.

THE CHURCH

JAMES P. NOONAN

James P. Noonan, Vice President of the American Federation of Labor and President of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, was born in St. Louis in 1878. His father was an agriculturalist, and the son attended school until the age of fourteen, when he was sent into the mills. Thereafter he worked at various trades, becoming familiar with many phases of American labor conditions, and finally became a journeyman electrician, a trade which he followed until 1905.

On the outbreak of the Spanish American War he enlisted as a private in the Eighth U. S. cavalry. After leaving the service he was very active in union affairs, and in 1905 was made vice president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and thenceforth devoted all his time to union work. In 1919 he became editor of the *Electrical Workers' Journal.*

He has always kept abreast of developments in the power industry, and has served on many power commissions. He is a member of the United States-St. Lawrence River Commission, the Giant Power Commission of Pennsylvania, and the National Research Council. He is the author of a monograph on *Labor's Part in Power Production,* which was submitted at the World Power Conference in London in 1924, to which he was the American labor delegate. He has also served on the Highway Safety Commission and on the United States Committee for Seasonal Employment in the Building Trade.

In 1919 he was elected president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and has been on the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor since 1924.

He is, he writes, despite Irish extraction, "a continuous and ardent advocate of peaceful relations in industry."

To express the attitude of labor toward the Church would be to attempt a task beyond the powers of any individual. All too often statements of doctrines put forth as authoritative and representative of a given group are simply the opinions of writers colored by their personal experience or, worse still, the outcome of an opposing philosophy to which they are more or less rigidly bound.

Labor is, after all, a portion of society—a very considerable portion in point of numbers at least—and therefore, as might be expected, it embraces every shade and degree of religious faith and belief, from pantheism to atheism.

The experience garnered in a quarter of a century of intimate contact with the active elements within the labor movement, and contact rather less intimate with representatives of the Church, leads me to make these observations:

The Church, using the word in its broadest sense so that we may think of all creeds as falling within the designation, is the spokesman of the most wonderful and potent forces with which the human family comes into contact.

The fact that for thousands of years the Church has withstood the persecution of the mighty, the slanders and calumnies of ignorant and ambitious materialists, and the ridicule visited upon it by some of the sharpest minds that know how to get the ear of the people, and that it still exerts an enormous influence for good upon the everyday life of mankind, is surely proof of a vigorous constitution.

No one would have the temerity to set up the claim that all of the things done in the name of the Church have been right things to do, or that the doing of a thing that is wrong by a servant or representative of the Church makes that thing right, or that ambitious persons have never used the Church to further their personal ends. But all of this has failed utterly to cancel the value of the Church as an agency for good. The fact is that these brilliant but unscrupulous minds, with all existing agencies for use as a vehicle toward accomplishing their ends to choose from, in pitching upon the

Church as the most valuable and effective means through which to win the people over to their views, have paid to the Church a very sincere, if inverted, compliment. Every movement—labor included—has been used by self-seekers within it for the furtherance of schemes of their own.

The attitude of the Church toward labor is not to be judged by those few outstanding and oft-quoted instances in which its servants—priests, ministers, rabbis—have taken a newspaper stand either for or against labor in any particular local dispute. Fundamentally, all creeds are sympathetic to those who toil and produce the real wealth of the world. "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden," finds its counterpart in the literature of the various religions from the time that the Vedas were first inscribed, and it is the foundation stone of the organizations of labor. "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not," might well be the guidon of the labor movement in its fight to abolish child labor in mill, mine, and factory. Our common laws, which after all only voice a common agreement upon a standard of social conduct, are based on religious laws that antedate them.

The Church and the Labor Movements have much in common. Both rest for a foundation upon ideals which make their appeal to that which is finest in human nature; together they stand for the sanctity of the home and family, provision of the means required for clean, healthy living, and honest and equitable dealings between man and man, and group and group of men. Both are striving for the Brotherhood of Man, as our right human response to the Fatherhood of God.

Again, both alike are objects of pursuit by a horde of exponents of so-called modern "isms" that seek to at-

tach themselves barnacle-like to any recognized, established, and worthy movement as a means of obtaining popular recognition. The Church and the Labor Movement are again alike in that, even in their periods of wealth, position, or power, their success must depend upon their continued appeal to the great masses of the people in behalf of justice and right, and their efforts to make our stay here fruitful of better things and our passing less fearsome and hopeless.

When anti-Church movements have faded back into the limbo from which they emerged, men will still be worshiping God collectively and the rock of faith will remain solid as adamant as the centuries pass.

WHAT THE CHURCH NEEDS TO BE SAVED

ARTHUR O. WHARTON

The President of the American Association of Machinists was born in 1873, in Kansas. His father was a farmer. He graduated from the primary school in Topeka. At the age of thirteen he was apprenticed as a machinist. He became very popular with the other workers, and rose rapidly until finally he was engineer of the city water and light plants in Crawfordsville, Ind., and Ft. Madison, Iowa. From 1902 to 1907 he was the district general chairman of the International Association of Machinists. From that time until 1920 he was president of the Railroad Employees' department of the American Federation of Labor. In 1918 he was appointed member of the United States Railroad Labor Board, where he served as chairman on the board of the Railroad Wages and Working Conditions. In the war he also served on the Committee of Labor, Council of National Defense. During this time he was in charge of negotiations on twenty-four Southwestern railroads. Strikes resulted on only four. Every one was settled within from three days to eight months, and every one was won by the union. He was chairman of the committee of the Southwestern railroads for negotiating a joint agreement affecting thirteen railroads and six federal shop crafts, and involving about forty thousand men. He was responsible for the original draft of the constitution of the Railway Employees' department of the American Federation of Labor. It has been said that had he been born in the home of an employer, he would now be one of the leading railroad executives in the United States.

LABOR unions, we think, have been greatly misunderstood and in many instances grossly misrepresented (a) because there are so many people who know practically nothing of their work, the great good they have done and are accomplishing, and their persistent, unrelenting determination to place the workers of the nation on a higher plane, morally, physically, and mentally; and (b) because of the selfish, bitter antagonism of certain employers and their premeditated policy of misleading

the public with respect to the activities and purposes of the Labor Movement.

Just what Labor thinks of the Church is probably influenced in part by deductions based on what many believe to be the indifference of the Church toward Labor. If there is antipathy toward the Church by Labor, it is due largely to the failure of the Church to study the Labor Movement. Does the Church understand the basic necessity for self-organization from the viewpoint of the worker, the general and historical background of master and servant, the inhuman treatment accorded the worker by an unrestrained, selfish, and autocratic employing class, Labor's mission, its principles, its accomplishments, its aspirations, its potential power and moral influence for the uplift of all mankind?

The conclusions arrived at in this article are based on many years of close association with workers throughout industry; they reflect my personal reaction to the opinions of multitudes of workers who have from time to time expressed their views regarding the Church and its attitude toward Labor, but I am not in any sense authorized to speak officially for Labor.

The vast majority of workers speak of Jesus Christ and the Church as two separate entities, because they believe in Christ and his teachings, yet find little of the spirit of the Brotherhood of Man in actual practice in the Church of to-day.

What Did the Church Do to Lessen the Long Hours Imposed on Labor?

Men who toil in the shops, mines, mills, and factories, and who, prior to the advent of the labor union, were forced to work twelve hours or, including prepara-

tory time, between fourteen and fifteen or more hours per day, and not infrequently seven days per week, are prone to inquire why the Church failed to use its great power and influence to alleviate this inhuman treatment of the workers? It is not an adequate answer to say that the Church is interested in saving souls and therefore is not concerned with the physical well-being of the great mass of humanity.

Insanitary Work Places

To what extent has the Church used its potential influence to correct the evils arising from the "sweat-shop" systems, the hell-holes where human beings were kept at their tasks until they dropped from exhaustion superinduced by dark, dingy workshops, polluted air, and general insanitary conditions? Would Christ have stood idly by, or invented excuses for His failure to act? His teachings clearly point the course He would have pursued to relieve these poor, helpless, weak, suffering victims of man's inhumanity to man.

Women in Industry

Is the Church fulfilling its mission if it assumes that it is not within its province to fearlessly advocate justice as well as chastity and obedience? What institution should be more concerned than the Church in safeguarding and promoting the welfare of the women, upon whom the future of the human race depends? Is it to be presumed that religious worship and teaching the Gospel represent the sum-total of the Church's duty and obligation to mankind, or should the Church teach and expound in addition the principles and precepts of justice as related to economic conditions of those who toil and labor in the interest of society?

Other Activities of the Church

Labor observes an increasing tendency on the part of the Church to regulate what man may eat, drink, or smoke, where and how he shall spend his Sundays, the character and kind of amusements he may participate in, and various other activities, many of which seem more or less trivial; all of which leads the average worker to ponder rather seriously just why it is that the Church can vigorously advocate and promote legislation seeking to curtail his liberty to enjoy, in his own way, the limited number of leisure hours at his disposal, and yet turn a deaf ear to the cry of tortured men, women, and children for relief from the curse of low wages, long hours, and scores of other industrial conditions and abuses which inevitably pave the way for numberless cases of moral turpitude.

The following is a concrete illustration of the careful planning, expense, and time contributed by thousands of active leading lights in the churches throughout the country. Undoubtedly this organized campaign is inspired and kept alive by the clergy, with the approval of those in authority in each church.

WOULD PUT CAPITAL OF NATION IN RIGHT PLACE, 65 DELEGATES ARE TOLD

COUNCIL HOLDS SESSION

The enactment of the Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia would have a beneficial effect upon the representatives of foreign governments here, the Rev. David G. Wylie, of New York City, president of the United Council to Secure a Sunday Rest Law for the Nation's Capital, declared yesterday at a meeting of the council held in the Congress Hall Hotel.

Sixty-five delegates from cities throughout the country gathered at the council meeting to hear reports from committees which have been sending letters to citizens and legislators in the various States urging upon them the reasons why they believe that the District should have a Sunday closing law.

The Rev. Dr. Wylie gave thirteen reasons why the law should be enacted, among which were: "It puts the Capital of the Nation in its right place," "It promotes public morality," and "It is for the best interests of the people of the District of Columbia."

Canon W. S. Chase, of Brooklyn, N. Y., declared that the bill would prevent Washington people from employing others to amuse them on Sunday, but it would hinder no one from amusing himself on Sunday or helping to amuse others, provided he has no "selfish, commercial motive."

A Washington committee was appointed to coöperate with the national organization.[1]

Here we have, according to the above statement, a national organization promoted and financed by the churches generally, for the avowed purpose of closing every place of amusement in the District of Columbia on Sunday. They express the belief that such legislation would have a beneficial effect upon representatives of foreign governments, the implication being that success in the United States will pave the way for similar activities and results in foreign countries.

It would seem that the churches are groping in a sort of blind and helpless way to compel church attendance. They have likewise sought to stop card-playing, dancing, checkers, chess, and dominoes, baseball, football, basket ball, golf, tennis, hockey, and practically every

[1] Quoted from the *Washington Post,* Saturday, January 27, 1928.

other pastime or athletic game. In some instances they have succeeded in having laws enacted preventing citizens from painting or repainting the home they lived in or performing any other labor on Sunday which they decided was non-essential to the immediate sustenance of life or health. In other instances they have succeeded in having laws enacted making it a misdemeanor to sell food, clothing, cigars, cigarettes, tobacco, candy, chewing gum or soda water, lemonade or ice cream on Sunday. These and many other activities, aside from saving souls, have had the militant support of the Church.

Thinking Labor, in increasing numbers and persistency, is asking why the Church is not interesting itself and actively coöperating in the great human struggle sponsored by Organized Labor for social and economic justice.

It is the belief of many in the ranks of Labor that the Church has lost ground with the great masses of workers in just the proportion it has failed to follow the teachings and example of Christ, the Carpenter. Did Christ ignore the appeals of the poor, the weak, the stricken, or did he succor and defend them?

Hopeful Signs of An Awakening

The following declaration was made at a conference held in New York under the auspices of the Department of Social Relations of the Congregational Churches of the United States:

> "The first great task in the experiment in industrial exploration," according to Dr. Worth M. Tippy, Secretary of the Social Relations Committee of the Federal Council of Churches, who led the discussion yesterday, "is

to swing the churches back into the struggle for the life of the masses and for the churches to rededicate themselves to the forty-five million workers in the United States."

"It is immensely important," he said, "for the churches to be in the forefront of what is being done for the workers. The employer should be shown that religion is dedicated to human welfare. The effectiveness of the Church is finally determined not by the intellectual influence it exerts so much as the spiritual and emotional influence that touches a man's heart."

Edward L. Israel of Baltimore, Chairman of the Social Justice Commission of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, suggested practical ways of contact between the ministry and labor, among which were the exchange of speakers by the labor temples and chambers of commerce, closer coöperation between churches and welfare organizations, the education of ministers in the terminology of labor, and the establishment by the church of forums where the minister could speak "fearlessly" on specific problems of industry "without having to worry about his job and apologize to the church."

Dr. Israel asserted that the church had talked too much in generalities. With the exception of a few leaders, he declared, there is an absolute lack of understanding of what the application of religion to the concrete social life of America means.

"There is too much preaching of ideals," he said, "and not enough practical aims. Here is a concrete conflict—agitation—and the Church goes in as a neutral investigator. It is ridiculous to say we are neutral. We stand for very definite principles, for human rights, collective bargaining, certain hours of labor and we don't have to apologize for it."

Dr. E. G. Guthrie, general director of the Chicago Congregational Missionary and Extension Society, asserted that "the Church has had no mind of its own since cap-

italism came to the fore, and will not have until that state is dispelled." [1]

Labor is not unmindful of the character of social research work being undertaken separately and collectively by such Church organizations as the Federal Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Council, and the Conference of American Rabbis.

The Interchurch Steel Strike Reports by the Commission of Inquiry, Interchurch World Movement, represents a substantial contribution to the cause of humanity and served to present facts surrounding the employment of men in the steel industry that aroused a sense of resentment against this great corporation throughout the civilized world. The report on the "Enginemen's Strike" on the Western Maryland Railroad, is another contribution worthy of note. It was prepared and issued jointly by: The Department of Research and Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the Social Action Department of The National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Social Justice Commission of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

This report attempts to set forth the facts in an impartial manner; to point out the weaknesses and failures of both parties to the controversy, the social and economic effect of the strike upon the communities along the lines of this railroad, and the effect of the strike upon the religious life of the strikers as well as the effect on the Church itself.

Attitude of Labor Toward the Church

It is the writer's opinion that Labor is not antagonis-

[1] From a quoted article appearing in the *New York Times* of December 30, 1927.

tic to the Church: its apparent indifference to the Church has been augmented by the growing belief that the Church has been indifferent to its welfare. It is the general opinion that the Church can restore confidence and win the respect and whole-hearted support of labor whenever it unselfishly determines that the interests of labor are the interests of the Church.

QUESTIONS FROM THE LEFT

ABRAHAM J. MUSTE

There are few more picturesque and dramatic careers than that of the author of this chapter. He was born January 8, 1885, in Zeerikzee, Netherlands. His father, a laborer in a furniture factory, emigrated to the United States early in the life of the boy. Muste had a brilliant record in school, graduating with an A. B. and M. A. degree from Hope College, Holland, Mich., an institution of the Dutch Reformed Church. Subsequently he graduated from New Brunswick Theological Seminary, and from Union Theological Seminary in 1913. He also did three years of post-graduate work at New York University and Columbia. From 1909 to 1910 he was minister of the Fort Washington Reformed (Collegiate) Church in New York City, and from 1915 to 1918 pastor of the Central Congregational Church at Newtonville, Mass., one of the largest and wealthiest churches in Newton. Because he did not believe that it was in accordance with Christ's principles to murder men with bayonets and poison gas, he resigned from the pastorate during the World War, rather than cause a split in his church. During 1918-1919 he was minister of the Friends' Meeting House at Providence, R. I. In the spring of 1919 he became interested in the Lawrence (Mass.) textile strike and did active work helping the strikers. He particularly urged the workers to win by lawful and peaceful means. Nevertheless he was arrested and beaten by the police on the preposterous charge of inciting the workers to riot, but was subsequently freed. From 1919 to 1921 he was general secretary of the Amalgamated Textile Workers of America. In 1919 he also was one of the leaders in the 44-hour-week strike in Paterson. In the spring of 1921 he helped to found Brookwood Labor College and has since been chairman of the faculty. Brookwood is the only resident labor college run and operated by and for the workers in America.

CHRISTIANITY has revolutionary implications for a system that stresses the acquisitive rather than the social motive, and which proceeds largely by the method of strife rather than that of education, persuasion, and love. In their pronouncements on political, social, and economic questions, the churches quite frequently refer, though in guarded language, to these implications. In

practice, however, the churches which interest themselves at all in labor and industrial questions confine themselves, in a great majority of instances, to advocating moderate reforms rather than insisting upon drastic changes of motive, aim, and method. Such measures as abolition of child labor, extension of educational opportunity, gradual increase of wages and reduction of hours, old-age compensation and unemployment insurance, the right of employes to organize, and the settlement of industrial disputes by conciliation and arbitration, are advocated by "advanced" ministers and churches who feel that they are putting the social message of Christianity into practice.

It happens that in taking this line, they are in close accord with the main body of the American labor movement at the present time; with the leadership, for example, of the A. F. of L. and most of the great independent unions, such as the Railroad Brotherhoods. These also are definitely non-revolutionary in temper. They have no serious quarrel with the economic or ethical foundations of the present system. They want to get ahead and improve their own position in the scheme of things. There are abuses, of course, which must be corrected. The benefits that accrue from the operation of industry must be more widely spread. Prosperity must be made universal. But prosperity is very emphatically what we are after, and that involves a strong disposition against disturbing the status quo, of looking too narrowly into its fundamental assumptions.

On the whole, therefore, there is a decidedly friendly feeling at present between the official labor movement and the official church. Each party lays the flattering unction to its soul that this is highly significant; that it

indicates that we are moving toward a realization of Christian ideals in industry; that the church has become practical and progressive, the labor movement constructive and an agency for the advancement of Christianity.

It is the purpose of this paper, without for a moment denying that certain advances have been made, to probe into these assumptions, to inquire whether religious leaders and institutions, instead of confining themselves largely, when it comes down to it, to advocating the moderate immediate demands of the labor movement, should not busy themselves with a more fearless and thorough analysis of the motives, the spirit, the ultimate fruits of modern industrialism.

> I am a revolutionist [says Henry de Man, former president of the Belgian Labor College, in his important work, *The Psychology of Socialism,* now fortunately available in an English translation (be it observed, in order to prevent misunderstanding, that the book is largely a criticism of dogmatic Socialism and Bolshevism)]. I am a revolutionist: this means that the transition from a capitalist system to a socialist system is for me a spiritual motive which can only enter my mind as the conception of an antagonism between two incompatible moral principles. The detestation of social injustice, of the degradation of human dignity, of bourgeois selfishness, of philistine greed, of conventional hypocrisy, and of the degeneration of taste, which led me in early youth to revolt against the outlooks of my social environment, has become intensified as the years have passed. I find the cultural atmosphere of contemporary bourgeois society irrespirable. I cannot go on living unless I withdraw from it at intervals in a more direct way than by mere activities on behalf of socialism—either by refreshing myself through contact with unsophisticated nature, or else by delighting in the beauties handed down to us from earlier ages.

I quote this passage not so much in order to indicate agreement or disagreement with it, as because it is typical. It is, as has already been suggested, the kind of utterance that is not made in any but very radical labor circles in the United States to-day, and that is not made either in the churches, save in exceptional cases. It is the kind of utterance that was quite common, however, in labor circles before the war. It is the kind of thing that Walter Rauschenbusch used to say. It is the kind of thing we can readily imagine Jesus saying, and many of the great prophetic and mystic figures. The reason why such things are not said in respectable church and labor circles to-day is the same as the one that accounts for the election of Harding and Coolidge by an overwhelming majority—"Prosperity." America has come into her own. She sits on top of the world. We are well fed. Why should we revolute, why be so childish and impractical as to bite the hand that feeds us?

Consider for a moment, however, some of the points at which it would appear the Christian must meet the present system with an absolute rejection, where his "spiritual motive" can express itself only in "the conception of an antagonism between two incompatible moral principles." In the old days, as it has been said, "the handicraftsman worked because it was his duty as a Christian, and because he took pleasure in his occupation, although it brought him no more than a modest competence, and although his children had little hope of bettering their station." In a country like the United States, no one can any longer live in this spirit of moderation, contentment, of "loyalty to the moral ties connecting the laborer with the land, and the worker with the work shop." If he does, he is hopelessly left behind in the struggle. He cannot make a modest livelihood.

He becomes a down-and-out farmer or a migratory worker. The great aim in life is "to get on in the world," to "get ahead." Capitalism frankly depends upon this motive to develop the drive for production that it needs in the masses, and the qualities of energy, push, intense application, greed for success that it requires in its leaders. The masses are pretty well imbued with this psychology now. The labor movement is not offering much resistance to it any more. Can the church respect it? Is keeping up with the Joneses, or getting ahead of them, a motive with which it can compromise in any measure?

A closely related problem is presented by the stimulation of the acquisitive motive by capitalism. Capitalism must stimulate wants in people, ever more wants, in order that its immense production may be absorbed, the wheels of industry kept turning, the competition for profits maintained. The man who walks to-day must ride in a Ford to-morrow, in a Dodge next year, a Cadillac the year after, and so on ad infinitum. The churches inveigh occasionally against the individual who yields to the temptation to acquire things, especially if he permits himself to be overpersuaded by high-pressure salesmanship and buys something on which he cannot keep up the payments. That is extravagance. But what is the good of scolding the individual when the institution of high-pressure salesmanship is kept up; when it is indeed indispensable for keeping the system in operation; when its practitioners are the people who put pep into our men's clubs, and by their contributions keep the churches going?

Here in America especially, conditions have conspired to develop in great numbers of people the gambler's instinct. The country has been so rich, its devel-

opment so rapid, so many have become wealthy by "striking oil" rather than by the practice of the copy-book maxims of sobriety, industry, and thrift, that our whole nation is imbued with the get-rich-quick, the get-something-for-nothing, the get-results-and-don't-bother-too-much-about-the-methods psychology. That, I think, is one of the great reasons why we have graft in our political life. Americans are not inherently low-down creatures as compared with Englishmen, Germans, and Frenchmen, among whom this evil is much less prevalent. We simply gamble—in politics as elsewhere. The same thing applies to the labor movement. In our American unions, we have graft on a scale unknown in the movement in England, Germany, or France, and for the same reason. If Brindell or "Umbrella Mike" get the "results" for their followers, what more can you ask? The followers also have the gambler's instinct and admire the fellow who "gets away with it." But can the churches tolerate such a psychology? They can, of course, because they do; but should they? In tolerating it, are they not sacrificing a chance to stimulate and really help labor itself?

On the technical side—with certain reservations, to be sure—there continues the tendency to which Frederick W. Taylor referred as the ideal of simplifying the work to such a degree that it can be done by a trained gorilla. As someone else has put it, the physical load is taken off the worker and put on the machine; the mental load is taken off the worker and put into the office. What position has the church, with its doctrine of the infinite worth of the individual soul, its insistence on the importance of spontaneity and creativity, to take over against such a tendency as this? The labor movement has opposed it in the interests of craftsmanship

when it could, but it is well-nigh helpless at present, especially in the highly mechanized industries where the tendency is at its height.

Many more such problems might be mentioned if space permitted. They would seem to be pretty fundamental for anyone who has the Christian philosophy of life and who is concerned about making the living of such a life possible on earth. It does not seem plausible, on the face of it, that they can be adequately dealt with by church or labor forces that are themselves so complacent toward our modern industrial system and civilization. Those Christian thinkers who are interested in a radical change in our industrialism, and who are skeptical about the possibility of solving the spiritual and ethical problems, which we have suggested, by respectable reforms which leave the system as a whole pretty much unaltered, will naturally look about them to see if there are other forces in the modern world which challenge with some degree of thoroughness and energy the dominant tendency. When they do so, they find at work the forces of radical labor, having their extreme expression, of course, in the Communist or Bolshevist movement. For the most part radicalism, however, is to both labor and the church to-day the very incarnation of the evil one, or is at best regarded as an unscientific, clumsy, and visionary way to achieve what in certain instances may be desirable aims.

I am not here concerned to argue that this view is wrong, but simply to suggest that the serious-minded in the church need to think the matter through more seriously than they have yet done. If modern industrialist and imperialist civilization is as direct and flagrant a challenge to the Christian view of life as the church has ever been called upon to meet—and that is a position

for which a very strong case can be made out—then the church is truly confronted with an overwhelming task, and can perhaps hardly afford to ignore, and even in some measure to work at cross-purposes with, the only major force that is openly and energetically combating the prevailing trend.

It may be said that when we see the reds, there is "no comeliness that we should desire them." There is truly much in their method and manner that is offensive, often it seems unnecessarily so, to the sensibilities of those brought up in a middle-class atmosphere and on traditional Christian morals. Still this complaint of being uncouth, assertive, impolite, breakers of the accepted rules of the game, has frequently been made. People made it about Jesus, for example. The squeamishness that some people manifest toward the Bolsheviks to-day may be another manifestation of that tendency to be overparticular about "the outside of the cup and the platter" but careless about their contents, of which Jesus complained, in the good, respectable, church people of his own day. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the spirit and practice of Bolshevism, for example, need Christianization, may it not be the business of the church to tackle precisely that job, instead of busying itself with dispensing comfort to the beneficiaries of the existing system, or inspiring those who would reform it, but at no cost to themselves?

Historically speaking, may it not perhaps be said that the genuine test in critical times comes in one's attitude toward those dubbed extremists? In England in the seventeenth century, the important question at a certain point came to be whether you were with Cromwell or against him; not whether you held the opinion, more or less academically, that it might be desirable to limit

somewhat the powers of the king. In America in the eighteenth century, the real question came to be whether you were with Samuel Adams, John Hancock, and George Washington, or against them; not whether you agreed with some of the Tories that George the Third had been impolite and unwise about certain matters.

It may be observed in closing that when it comes to friendly relations between the churches and the radical elements in the world labor movement, it is precisely those in the church who are most definitely revolutionist in tendency, in revolt against the prevailing standards and ideals, who find themselves confronted with a great difficulty as to the method of procedure. They are pacifistic, whereas the radical labor movement is militant and to no slight degree militaristic. Here is a serious problem indeed. No adequate statement of it, not to speak of a solution, can be attempted here. We may, however, make three important observations of a preliminary nature.

First, there is danger of crying "violence" when no external force is being applied at all; or, to put it the other way about, of thinking that there is really "peace" when there is no disturbance; that everything is running smoothly, when nobody is registering any complaints. The moment something is said that arouses deeper emotions, that makes people question, that disturbs the status quo and shakes the powers-that-be out of their complacency and lethargy, then "disturbers of the peace" are at work, "the world is being turned upside-down," and so on. If pacifically inclined Christians shy away from economic radicalism because it is performing that function in the modern world, it can only be because they attach more importance to superficial good manners than to honesty; and, quite possibly, because

they cannot bear to be close to people who are doing in some fashion what they, the Christian pacifists, ought to be doing, and are not doing at all.

Secondly, there is often the greatest blindness as to just where the violence and the roots of violence are. Jesus and the disciples were turning the world upside-down in the estimation of the estimable people of their day. That the Pharisees, for example, or the Roman armies, had turned it upside-down, did not occur to them. The nationalists are the people who are said to be "making a revolution" in China to-day. What of the Powers during the past hundred years? "We deplore class struggle, and declare against all class denomination—sympathizing with labor's desire for a better day, and an equitable share in the profits and management of industry, we stand for orderly and progressive social construction instead of revolution by violence." Thus says the statement of the Social Ideals of the Church. The assumption appears to be that it is the radical elements that threaten a revolution by violence. But is not the régime against which they are in revolution itself founded upon violence and deceit? Does it not daily extend its power over the lives of men, in backward countries, for example, by violence and deceit? Carrying on, in other words, a "revolution by violence"? If moral judgment is to pass upon realities and not appearances, then here is a problem that requires more careful thinking through than has yet been given it, lest in their anxiety to wash their hands of some manifestations of violence Christian pacifists be supporting much more horrible forms of the same evil.

Lastly, the Christian pacifist is presumably a revolutionist. He, too, is in revolt against the world as it is

and would bring in a new order. Only he has a more efficient way for bringing in the rule of truth and brotherhood than the violent revolutionist. There are two ways of abolishing monarchy: the people may put the king away, or the king may abdicate. The Christian pacifist feels that by non-violent methods he can persuade the powers-that-be to abdicate. If in the long run he fails, he will find himself abandoned in practice, if not discredited in theory. However, anyone may fail, and the charge of futility and vanity is one that can be made against many things in this world. But the Christian pacifist is not only futile, but a hypocrite and a liar, if he does not stick to his job, make an honest effort to bring about the revolution in his own way, concentrate some ninety percent of his energies on working to make the holders of power and privilege abdicate, rather than preaching to revolutionists to postpone their violence. He must deal with disease, not with symptoms, if he is to gain any respect.

AMERICAN LABOR AND THE CHURCH[1]

WILLIAM GREEN

William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, is fifty-six years of age, having been born at Coshocton, Ohio, March 3, 1873, the son of Hugh Green, an English miner, and Jane (Oram) Green, a native of Wales.

He gained his education in the public schools of Coshocton, and when eighteen years old went to work in the mines with his father.

Almost immediately he took an active part in the miners' union. From 1900 to 1906 he was a sub-district president and from 1906 to 1910 was Ohio district president of the United Mine Workers.

In 1912 he was elected international secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers, the office formerly held by William B. Wilson, who became the first secretary of labor in President Wilson's cabinet. A year later he was elected vice president and member of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, succeeding the late John Mitchell in that office.

William Green was a delegate-at-large from Ohio to the 1924 Democratic national convention in New York, and was a delegate-at-large to the Baltimore convention in 1912 which nominated Woodrow Wilson, and alternate-at-large to the San Francisco Democratic national convention in 1920.

Mr. Green served two terms in the Ohio State Senate, of which he was Democratic floor-leader for both terms and president for both terms. He introduced and secured the enactment of the Ohio Workmen's Compensation Law, which has been accepted by organized labor as the model for other States to adopt. He also introduced and secured the passage of the Ohio Mine Run Law, an act which has proved to be of great benefit to the mine workers of Ohio and all those employed in the central competitive field (consisting of Ohio, Western Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Illinois).

THE American labor movement believes in religion and in the church. It does not attack spiritual forces, but supports them. It realizes, however, that some churches and some church members fail to comprehend

[1] From an address delivered at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York City and subsequently revised by Mr. Green for publication in this volume.

and appreciate problems of labor which are closely related to the questions of humanity, justice, and religion.

The workers yearn and strive for happiness and the realization of fixed ideals. They know that there are many privileges and blessings which they do not have. Their longings for the enjoyment of the blessings which they are daily denied are bitter and intense. They are no different from the rest. They have vision and through it they see, though perhaps dimly, the golden rays of promise and the radiance of hope. With eyes gazing into the future they see the dawn of a new day, a day in which their dreams will come true and their disappointed hopes will be fully realized. Having glimpsed the unmistakable evidences of that new and better era to which all creation moves, it is but natural that they should seek to bring about acceptance and enjoyment of this better day and better life.

Christ said, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." In uttering these words he was speaking to the Pharisees, but he was referring to his followers. Many of them were working men and the common people heard him gladly. We are permitted to know that he lived in a humble home and that he was known as the Carpenter. It is fair to assume that during his early manhood he worked and served as a laborer and experienced the lot of a working man. We cannot believe that the master had in mind a life degraded and dwarfed by poverty and unreasonable toil. Such a life is not an abundant life. Nor do we believe He meant that through such a mode of living we could develop the higher and more abundant spiritual life. We believe that the Master meant that through the application of the principle of justice and fair dealing, which He repeatedly announced,

the great mass of the people, through all the generations which were to come, would be permitted to enjoy life and to enjoy it abundantly.

Of what does life consist? Does it mean a mere existence or a state of being wherein people are deprived of the enjoyment of life? Does life mean mere existence—birth, death, and hours of struggle and suffering intervening? Does it mean that within the boundaries of human existence a few, a favored few, are to have an abundance of the good things of life and the great masses of the people are to live in poverty and want? Was this the philosophy he expounded and the doctrine he preached? Is it for this the Master came?

From every heart in which the teachings of our Lord have found acceptance the answer must be "No."

Life as he interpreted it meant the satisfying of the physical needs and the development of the spiritual forces of the soul. It is significant that he was mindful of the physical needs of the people in that he fed them before he preached. Life without a full and complete satisfaction of hunger and the desire for clothing and physical comforts is wholly incomplete. But that is not all. The intellectual, the cultural, and the spiritual phases of our lives require opportunity for complete development. The material and spiritual elements of life are so intermingled that they are inseparable. The highest attainment of our spiritual lives can be reached only through the establishment of humane living conditions.

Life is precious and potential. One cannot properly measure or appraise the value of a human life, nor can the possibilities of human lives be accurately appreciated or determined. Life must be protected and conserved. It must be protected against exploitation, oppression,

and extinction. It must be safeguarded in the home, in the mill, in the mine, and in the factory. This is the highest duty of society. It cannot be evaded or rejected. Society must meet this challenge lest civilization perish.

As a flower unfolds its petals to the sun, diffusing its fragrance and disclosing its beauty, so life expands and grows beautiful in the warm sunshine of golden opportunity. How lovely is that perfect life which is sheltered from the wind and storm of adversity and is permitted to bring joy and inspiration to other lives!

The potential value of a life is revealed as opportunity for service presents itself. It has a twofold value, that which it gives and that which it receives. The character of service rendered depends upon ability and attitude. Service of an active nature depletes and exhausts the latent qualities of man. Through service the invisible powers of the soul and intellect are translated into action. In such circumstances we behold the finer qualities, the strength, and the capabilities of men. The world is the beneficiary of such service.

In return for this invaluable service the individual becomes the recipient of priceless benefits and blessings. His reward exceeds the service rendered because he becomes the beneficiary of the concentrated service rendered by his fellow men. He gives as an individual, but he receives from the multitude. In his time he serves humankind. His life is fleeting and of short duration, but even so he gathers wisdom and knowledge from the accumulated service of the millions who have preceded him. His labor is not for the moment. It is for eternity. The generations to come will benefit by his life of service.

With reverent care let us consider the language of

the great teacher: "I am come that they might have life and have it more abundantly." It is true he was addressing his words to a small group of people, but with clarity and vision he gazed into the future (perhaps toward our own time) and spoke, perhaps to us, to those associated with modern industry. His words may be applied to the present-day struggle for the enjoyment of life. When he spoke there was no modern industry, highly organized, exacting service from men, women, and children. No vexing problems of industry, such as we have to-day, existed then. Collective bargaining, with its collateral questions, was not an issue then. Steam and electricity and the intricate machinery of industry were undiscovered and unknown. The struggle for the recognition of the principle of righteousness has since become more intensified. Men and women who toil in the mills, factories, and mines of our nation are fighting, struggling, and sacrificing for the realization and enjoyment not only of life, but of life more abundantly.

Realizing the importance of the individual and his helplessness in the complicated social system which exists to-day, the workers have banded together, pooled their strength, and combined their efforts. The unsatisfied longings of the human soul for the enjoyment of an abundant life have moved the men and women of labor to action. They seek to secure, through collective effort and coöperation, for themselves and for their fellow workers, the attainment of this ideal. When their efforts are crowned with success they rejoice. When they fail they do not despair, but instead, press on with renewed vigor. The movement for legislation prohibiting the employment in industry of children of a tender age has for its purpose the protection of children and child life. Compulsory education legislation is

based upon lofty and humane considerations. The safeguarding of the strength of the women and mothers, through the passage of appropriate legislation limiting the hours of working women, is in the interest of humanity and our national life. The demand for a wage commensurate with present-day living standards, reasonable hours of toil, tolerable and humane conditions of employment, is inspired by the same high and noble purpose. Compensation for injured workers and the dependents of killed employees brings to the unfortunate victims of industry substantial assistance at the hour when it is most needed. A remedy for unemployment and the enactment of old-age pension legislation constitutes a part of the initiated but unfinished humane work of the forces of organized labor. The great and important movement of organized labor has set itself to the task of bringing about the acceptance of its claims for consideration of all these enumerated humane proposals.

The woes from which humanity suffers are due to our failure to comply with the laws and teachings of morality, religion, and justice. If these teachings were followed, the rights of employers and employees would be recognized and accepted. We must recognize that the forces of labor and capital have passed into a new era, an age of coöperation and reciprocal relationship. Militancy has long been tried. The power of capital has not succeeded in crushing the spirit of organization. Fairness demands that the attempts to prevent organization among the workers must cease.

Laboring people have fairly won recognition and the right to organize. The safety of our nation, the security of our institutions, and the happiness of our people call for serious thinking on the part of employing interests. Deep down beneath the surface of every militant

movement may be found the germ of revolution. True, it may be embryonic, but if it is allowed to develop it will grow and multiply until it menaces the very existence of the republic.

Organized wealth and combined capital cannot destroy organized labor, nor are they powerful and effective enough to prevent the workers from acting collectively. Time and experience have proven this assertion to be correct. As truth crushed to earth shall rise again, so organized units affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, when assailed and apparently crushed, reorganize, rebuild, and reëstablish themselves more strongly and firmly than ever. This being true, sagacity and wisdom teach that if organized labor cannot be overcome and subjugated it should be recognized and accepted as a functioning force in our economic life. Sound judgment, common sense, and the interests of all the people throughout the land call for the manifestation and exercise, on the part of all the elements which form industrial life, of a spirit of coöperation, understanding, and goodwill. It is to the achievement of this purpose that organized labor is irrevocably committed. It is only through the exercise of these virtues and qualities that the great mass of mankind can be brought nearer to the enjoyment of life. Not a life of oppression, of limitation, of ignorance, of want; not a life of drudgery and excessive toil; not a life from which is exacted every ounce of vitality and energy, but an abundant life—a life of freedom, of self-expression, of spiritual beauty, of educational advantages and opportunity for honest toil, with leisure, recreation, and material blessings. This is the life the Lord declared he brought to us, the life for which we strive and pray.

MY EXPERIENCE WITH THE CHURCH

JAMES S. WOODSWORTH

James S. Woodsworth, one of two labor representatives in the Canadian parliament, found his way into the labor movement through the ministry. Born in Toronto in 1874, a child of the parsonage, he was educated in Manitoba University and Victoria College and later took graduate work at Oxford. After finishing his studies he entered the Methodist ministry, where his main interest was in social service work. He spent four years working in rural missions and six as superintendent of All People's Mission, a social settlement among immigrants. In 1916-1917 he was director of the Bureau of Social Research for the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta.

During the war he was unable to reconcile Christian teachings with the demands of "patriots." He opposed conscription and was dismissed from his government position. Early in 1918 he resigned from the ministry and for a year supported his family by working as a longshoreman on the water front at Vancouver, where he joined the Longshoreman's Union.

In 1919, during the General Strike in Winnipeg, he edited the "Strike Bulletin," and within a week was arrested for seditious utterances. One of the counts against him, as he mentions in the following article, was the fact that he quoted a passage from the Bible!

Since then he has devoted all his time to labor and educational work in the Canadian labor movement, and in 1921 entered Parliament. He is the author of several books on the immigrant and rural communities and of numerous articles on labor in the Canadian press.

FOR over twenty years I was a minister in the Methodist Church. To-day I am outside the church, devoting my time to the labor movement.

My personal experience, and hence, perhaps, my point of view, cannot be regarded as those of the typical labor man, but they may help to interpret the feeling of labor toward the church.

To understand my attitude let me quote from my letter of resignation to the church in 1918.

> Within a short time after my ordination I was much troubled because my beliefs were not those that were com-

monly held and preached. The implications of the newer theological teaching that I had received during my B.D. course and in post-graduate work at Oxford revealed themselves with growing clearness and carried me far from the old orthodox position.

In 1902 I came to conference with my resignation in my pocket, but the urgent advice of the president and others of the senior ministers persuaded me to defer action. I accepted an invitation to become junior minister at Grace Church and for four years devoted myself largely to the practical activities of a large downtown church.

Ill health made necessary a year without a station. This gave me an opportunity of getting out of the routine and seeing things in a somewhat truer perspective. While in Palestine I decided that, come what might, I must be true to my convictions of truth. It seemed to me that, in the church, I was in a false position. As a minister I was supposed to believe and to teach doctrines which either I had ceased to believe or which expressed very inadequately my real beliefs. I carefully prepared a statement of my position and sent it with my resignation to the conference of 1907. A special committee appointed to confer with me reported that in their judgment my beliefs were sufficiently in harmony with Methodist standards to make my resignation unnecessary, and recommended that it be not accepted. The conference, without dissent, accepted the recommendation.

What could I do? Left intellectually free, I gratefully accepted the renewed opportunity for service. For six years, as superintendent of All People's Mission, I threw myself heartily into all kinds of social service work. Encouraged by my own experience, I thought that the church was awakening to modern needs and was preparing, if slowly, for her new tasks.

But, as years went by, certain disquieting conclusions gradually took form. I began to see that the organized church had become a great institution with institutional

aims and ambitions. With the existence of a number of denominations this meant keen rivalry. In many cases the interests of the community were made subservient to the interests of the church. Further, the church, as were many other institutions, was becoming increasingly commercialized. This meant the control of the policies of the church by men of wealth, and in many cases, the temptation for the minister to become a financial agent rather than a moral and spiritual leader. It meant, also, that anything like a radical program of social reform became in practice almost impossible. In my own particular work among the immigrant peoples, I felt that I, at least, could give more effective service outside denominational lines. Intellectual freedom was not sufficient—I must be free to work.

. . . . . .

According to my understanding of economics and sociology, the war is the inevitable outcome of the existing social organization with its undemocratic forms of government and competitive system of industry. For me, it is ignorance, or a closed mind, or camouflage, or hypocrisy, to solemnly assert that a murder in Servia or the invasion of Belgium or the glaring injustices and horrible outrages are the cause of the war.

Nor, through the war, do I see any way out of our difficulties. The devil of militarism cannot be driven out by the power of militarism without the successful nations themselves becoming militarized. Permanent peace can come only through the development of good-will. There is no redemptive power in physical force.

This brings me to the Christian point of view. For me, the teachings and spirit of Jesus are absolutely irreconcilable with the advocacy of war. Christianity may be an impossible idealism, but so long as I hold it, ever so unworthily, I must refuse, as far as may be, to participate in or to influence others to participate in war. When the policy of the State—whether that State be nominally

Christian or not—conflicts with my conception of right and wrong, then I must obey God rather than man. As a minister, I must proclaim the truth as it is revealed to me. I am not a pro-German, I am not lacking, I think, in patriotism; I trust that I am not a "slacker" or a coward. I had thought that as a Christian minister I was a messenger of the Prince of Peace.

The vast majority of the ministers and other church leaders seem to see things in an altogether different way. The churches have been turned into very effective recruiting agencies. A minister's success appears to be judged by the number of recruits in his church rather than by the number of converts. The position of the church seems to be summed up in the words of a general conference officer: "We must win the war, nothing else matters." There is little dependence on spiritual forces. The so-called Prussian morality that might makes right, and that the end justifies the means, is preached in its application if not in theory. "Military necessity" is considered to cover a multitude of sins. Retaliation, specifically repudiated by Jesus, is advocated. Private murder, under certain conditions, is lauded. Pacifism is denounced as a vice. Love is tempered by hatred.

Holding the convictions I do, what is my duty under such circumstances? The *Christian Guardian,* presumably voicing the thought of the church, discusses the case in its issue of May 1st:

"And if he be a preacher, we presume he may feel that it is cowardly to keep silence, and that truth demands that he testify to what he believes to be the truth. Consistency demands that we recognize this fact.

"But in time of war the state has something at stake, and it rightly refuses to allow a peace propaganda to be carried on in its midst. Not only so, but the church has a duty in the matter, and that is to prevent unpatriotic speeches in her pulpits. And if the minister who is a confirmed pacifist has a right to speak his mind freely, the

church which he serves has a right to see that he does not use her pulpits nor her authority to damage or defeat the efforts of patriots who are trying to win a righteous war. In every such case the country and the church have a right to insist not only on the absence of seditious or disloyal speech and action, but also on truest patriotic utterances, and if a man cannot conscientiously declare himself a patriot he has no business in any church which prides itself upon its patriotism."

Apparently the church feels that I do not belong and reluctantly I have been forced to the same conclusion. This decision means a crisis in my life. My associations, my education, my friends, my work, my ambitions have all been connected with the church. After twenty-two years it is hard to go out, not knowing whither I go. In taking this step, I have no sense of disloyalty to the memory of my honored father or the upbringing of my widowed mother. On the other hand, I have a growing sense of fellowship with the Master and the goodly company of those who, throughout the ages, have endeavored to "follow the gleam." I still feel the call to service, and trust that I may have some share in the work of bringing in the Kingdom.

Thus I broke with the church. A few months later, I found myself attempting to earn a living for my family as a longshoreman on the water front at Vancouver, B. C.

This meant an almost complete break with my earlier associations and habits of thought. The church did not belong to our rough world. The articles which I wrote at the time dealt almost exclusively with economic and social conditions. Only occasionally did I attempt to connect past and present. The following paragraphs indicate my line of thought while working.

In the good old days of long ago, when, on Sunday,

everyone went up to the House of the Lord, it was a pleasure to join with the multitude that kept holy day. We sang, "O day of rest and gladness." "No mortal cares disturbed my breast." Dressed in our Sunday clothes, surrounded by friendly faces, a comfortable home awaiting our return, life with all its alluring possibilities ahead, with hope quickened and soul strengthened by the service of music and exhortation and prayer —who has not experienced a time of pleasurable and, as we thought, profitable meditation?

But there are other and less pleasant experiences that lead to meditation. To turn reluctantly out of bed before daybreak on a winter's morning, to snatch a bit of breakfast, to walk a mile to work because the cars do not run early on Sundays, to stand all day long in the rain "on the slings," or with stiff hands wheel a heavy truck back and forward for hours over an uneven floor, to eat with unwashed hands at a cheap restaurant—then is the time to meditate. In fact, such circumstances make "one furiously to think."

Why work on Sunday? Simply because the work during the week has not brought in sufficient money to support the family for a week and Sunday work is paid as "time and a half." But "one should not work on Sunday"—so the boss believes. He will not even walk to church; he rides in his private car—"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." He joins in the response, "Lord, have mercy upon us and incline our hearts to keep Thy law." But his firm keeps its plant in operation every day in the week. He drops a coin into the collection for the poor. Whose coin? Do I receive all that I produce? Surely it pays someone to keep me working on Sundays, even at time and a half rates! He goes home to his wife and family and music and friends.

I work on in the rain out of hearing even of the church bells.

The church—a class institution—what does the church do to help me and those like me? The church supported by the wealthy—yes, "he who pays the piper calls the tune." That well-groomed parson, with his soft tones prophesying smooth things—well, I'm glad I'm not in his shoes!

But surely aside from its religious sanctions every man is entitled to one day in seven as a day of rest and recreation. So affirm the good people who support the Lord's Day Alliance. That is why they persecute or prosecute the little corner stores that sell fruit on Sunday. But what about the milkman who long before daylight starts out on his rounds to bring fresh milk for the breakfast coffee and the children's porridge? Has he a day of rest? What about the big industries that work eleven and thirteen hour shifts the year round? Why are they not prosecuted? The law, too, is a class institution. And is morality merely a class code and religion a superstition to keep the masses in subjection?

And why cannot I make enough during the week without working on Sundays? Our ancestors had numerous holidays. Even without the aid of machinery they produced enough and to spare. Here am I working like a draught animal, slaving under the eye of the foreman and all for the merest subsistence—didn't that Socialist speaker say the "wage slave" got only food, clothing, and shelter—only enough to keep and reproduce himself?

. . . . . .

Sabbath day meditations. Not pleasant, not comforting. But they are shaking us free from conventionalities. They are opening to us new avenues of thought,

new conceptions of justice, new ideals of morality. Who will say that they are less worthy than the meditations of our youthful days?

Yet that old-time happy Sunday—why is it not still possible for us all?

After a year as a longshoreman I was suddenly thrust into the limelight as one of the "Red leaders of the Winnipeg General Strike." It happened very simply.

Having been asked to address a number of Labor audiences across the country, I arrived in Winnipeg in the middle of the General Strike of 1919. The outside public has yet to be informed regarding the conspiracy to crush labor and the unscrupulous methods that were employed—including a lying press campaign. After the spectacular arrests of the leaders and the announcement that they were to be deported under the hastily passed legislation which had the effect of depriving those born outside of Canada, including British-born, of the right of trial by jury, I found myself attempting to edit the worker's paper, the "Strike Bulletin."

Within a week I was arrested and the paper suppressed. I was charged with seditious libel on six counts.

. . . . . .

The three articles for which I was primarily responsible constitute counts 3, 4, and 6 of the indictment. The viciousness of the prosecution, characteristic of the official activities, may be gauged by a consideration of the moderation shown in the articles—written, it should be remembered, after men had been shot down in the streets.

In law, each count stands by itself. Count 4 of the indictment read as follows:

The Jurors aforesaid do further present:

4. That J. S. Woodsworth, in or about the month of June, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Nineteen, at the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, unlawfully and seditiously published seditious libels in the words and figures following:

Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievousness which they have prescribed, to turn aside the needy from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor of my people, that widows may be their prey and that they may rob the fatherless. (Isaiah x. 1, 2.)

And they shall build houses and inhabit them, and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat, for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. (Isaiah lxv. 21, 22.)

If I, a well-known minister and social worker, could be arrested on such a charge, what chance had an obscure workman, to say nothing of an ignorant foreign immigrant?

And what of the church that made no protest—that, as a matter of fact, lined up almost solidly against labor?

Two years later, my path, as winding as that of Christian in the old steel engravings of *Pilgrim's Progress,* led to Parliament Hill. Another four years, and a kind critic, a minister of the gospel, writes, concerning me: "From pulpit to parliament has, in his case, been the right step."

Ah!

A step! Several steps! Which have been right? When did they become right?

Is this all the church has to say to me—and to

my young friends for whom life is still a high adventure?

In 1926, a request for an article on "My Religion" forced me to attempt to set down in words some of the changes that had taken place in my thinking, as follows:

> It is comparatively easy to say what my religion is *not*—it is not that of childhood days. Why should it be? Strange that in almost every other phase of life we greet change with a cheer but, in religion, we actually boast of arrested development. Paul declared, "Now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things." Why, in religious matters, should a man full grown, physically and mentally, continue to speak as a child, feel as a child, and think as a child?
>
> Again, my religion is not that of the church. Many of the historical dogmas seem to me entirely incompatible with scientific thought; much of the medieval ritual quite inadequate to express modern needs; and the institution itself too largely dominated by the commercial ideals of our age. Surely, the cry of the church as of the individual must be, "Build ye more stately mansions, O my soul!" We cannot live within the chambers of yesterday.
>
> Religion for me was once clear-cut. I could outline the scheme of salvation more clearly than I could analyze a sentence. Now "my religion" is not only less dogmatic, but it is less definite, less certain. Many might say that it is no religion at all. For me the change means emerging from the confines of a stuffy room into the sweet, pure air of God's out-of-doors.
>
> What then is religion? In my college days, philosophy was considered one department of knowledge, theology an entirely different one. Yet both discussed such problems as whether the world showed an intelligent design or whether man was a free agent. Religion was sharply distinguished from "mere morality," and those of us who dabbled in Christian Ethics were warned against con-

founding religion with "ill-digested sociology" and urged to preach the "simple gospel"—religion made a constant appeal to the emotional and aesthetic and yet music and art were considered to be simply the hand-maids of religion. Human affection was held to be quite distinct from divine love—sometimes in conflict with it.

For me, these lines of demarcation have ceased to exist. The story of the rocks is more credible than that of Genesis. "One impulse from a vernal wood" is as religious as a sermon; a socialist agitator may be as devoted as a foreign missionary; human love may become a real sacrament. Indeed if any one test is sufficient, he is most religious who loves most.

Some have thought of religion as the worship of "a Supreme Being." God is regarded as separate and above the world and then there is the attempt to bring the two together again. The infinite is distinguished from the finite and then the finite attempts to define the infinite!

How foolish for us—vanishing dewdrops of a summer's morn—to attempt to describe the Absolute in terms of our own little personalities!

My children are not familiar with hymns of adoration, but they have been taught the lines of Hartley Coleridge:

> So then believe that every bird that sings,
> And every flower that stars the fresh green sod,
> And every thought the happy summer brings,
> To the pure spirit, is a Word of God.

We have all come to recognize that according to the constitution of the human mind, God is—and must be—conceived in terms of our own deepest experiences—raised it may be to the nth degree. The pastoral tribesman thought of God as a Shepherd and offered to Him the firstlings of the flock; the peasant imaged Him as the sender of rain and fruitful seasons and brought to Him the first fruits of the harvest; the medieval workman conceived of Him as the Master Builder, the Architect

of the Universe, and built for him cathedrals crowded with choicest art. So others have thought of Him as King, as Judge, as Father.

We—we still use the old phrases. But how do we, the children of a scientific age, conceive of God?

Repelled by the connotations of the old terms, some among us reject the idea itself. But is not this very repudiation a striving after a higher ideal? As I write, my train is rushing forward through the night carrying me homeward. The universe too is driving onward—we may well believe it is toward some goal and inspired by some increasing purpose. But as I rest back in my seat in the car, I must confess that I am not bothering about the road bed or the train dispatchers or even possible accidents. I am being carried forward—that is enough. So in his study of phenomena or in his dealing with practical affairs, the modern man is not worrying much about first causes or final causes. He is absorbed in the consideration of the process itself. His faith is shown in his reliance upon the force which seems to be driving the world onward and upward.

And what is the modern man's distinctive offering?—What but a willingness to coöperate with the forces of progress?

Older religious thought was much concerned with the question of personal immortality. We frankly admit that from the strictly scientific point of view, the future is beyond our ken. We may think we find certain "intimations of immortality." Have we not all had moments of illumination when eternity became not a period of time but a quality of existence? But after all, our primary interest is with the present life. And we are none the less spiritual for that.

But if we no longer visualize ourselves either as "walking golden streets" or "gnashing our teeth in outer darkness," are we then left with no incentives to higher living? For myself I must own that I was never very keen on

being an angel with "a crown upon my forehead" and "a harp within my hand." But the inner urge toward higher things is as strong as ever—yes, much stronger.

No one who knows anything of the fierce joy of the conflict will worry very much about his "reward in heaven."

What of the "experimental religion" of our fathers? That which was considered the normal type in their day belonged to their day—not to ours. Spiritual adventures are forever new. For example, many to-day are experiencing a social re-birth that is as distinct and far-reaching in its effects as was the conversion of an earlier day. Religion is for me not so much a personal relation between "me" and "God" as rather the identifying of myself with or perhaps the losing of myself in some larger whole.

What of the life and teachings of Jesus? Well, they have been a potent influence in my life—strong enough, indeed, to force me to break with the church which, though calling itself Christian, sanctioned the war; strong enough to lead me to denounce the present social system as out of harmony with the teaching and spirit of the Carpenter of Nazareth.

Twenty years ago I made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. As, from a vantage point on the Mount of Olives I looked across to Jerusalem and tried to readjust my beliefs and manner of life in accordance with realities, there came to me with new force the words of Robertson of Brighton—the "sacrifice of Jesus must be completed and repeated in the life of each true follower."

The very heart of the teaching of Jesus was the setting up of the Kingdom of God on earth. The vision splendid has sent forth an increasing group to attempt the task of "Christianizing the Social Order." Some of us whose study of history and economics and social conditions has driven us to the socialist position find it easy to associate the ideal Kingdom of Jesus with the coöperative commonwealth of socialism.

Religion has been regarded as conformity with certain practices and dogmas handed down from the past. Religion for me is rather a reaching out to the future—a pressing toward a mark not clearly discerned. Is not the fear of breaking with old beliefs the most insidious kind of unbelief? Faith is a confident adventuring into the unknown.

Haul out; cast off; shake out every sail;
Steer for the deep waters only:
For we are bound where mariner hath not yet dared to go,
And we will risk the ship, ourselves and all.
O daring joy—but safe!
Are they not all the seas of God?
O farther, farther, farther sail!

In conclusion let me say that I have no antagonism to the church. I have many personal friends in the church. Occasionally I speak from church pulpits.

But my old love for, and faith in, the church is dead. My newer fellowships are largely outside the church. Only incidentally does my work bring me into touch with church activities.

Modern industrial and social and international problems are insistent. Will the church be a factor in their solution? Let the orators reply!

A LABOR CRITIQUE OF THE CHURCH

JAMES SIMPSON

James Simpson, since 1921 secretary of the Canadian Labor Party and treasurer-secretary of the Labor Temple in Toronto, is a native of Lancashire, England, where he was born in 1873. His father was a stone-mason, and after a brief schooling the boy went to work at the age of twelve, and when he was fifteen emigrated to Canada where he learned the printing trade. He worked for a time as a reporter on the *Toronto Star*, but soon devoted all his energies to the trade-union and labor movement which was just beginning to emerge as a factor in Canadian affairs. He became a member of the International Typographical Union, and in 1903 was sent as a delegate to the American Federation of Labor Convention. Since that time he has represented Canadian labor at trade-union and socialist conventions at Vienna, Birmingham, Geneva, and other centers. He has been active in various strikes, notably those of the miners in Nova Scotia in 1909, and of the printers in 1921-23; and under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act has served as arbitrator in many labor disputes. He has served on numerous government commissions on education, immigration, industrial training, et cetera, and has taken an active part in municipal politics, having been chairman of the Toronto Board of Education and a member of the City Council.

Mr. Simpson has written extensively on the labor movement, and one of his pamphlets, "Does Trade Unionism Pay?" was issued by the American Federation of Labor in 1911. He has also lectured throughout Canada and in England, Wales, and New Zealand in the interests of labor and of prohibition.

After the war he was active in preventing a split of the Canadian labor forces and favored the inclusion of the Communist sections.

Of all the institutions to which humanity looks for leadership in social, moral, and economic progress, none are more responsible than the Church and the Labor Movement. I do not regard either the Church or the Labor Movement as an infallible institution. Each is guilty of a departure from its high ideal as it grapples with the realities of life. This failure to reach the ideal should make the Labor Movement sympathize with the

Church in its impotency to solve the problems it has set out to solve. The Church, however, in its claim to Divine guidance and support, should be regarded as less liable to err than the Labor Movement, which depends largely on human limitations.

I was brought up an ardent supporter of the Methodist Church; in fact, my attendance upon the many meetings organized by the Church subjected me to a charge of "religious dissipation." I owe much to the Church for its contribution to my moral balance and spiritual outlook upon life. I believe that the man with a soul is the man who has an ideal and works towards that ideal, while the soulless man is he who has no ideal and therefore is not working towards any particular goal. The Church gave me an ideal, and that was to leave the world better than it was when I entered it. I was invited to study for the ministry, as my friends thought I had special talents to fit me for the work of that office. I was offered financial assistance if I would study for the ministry. I preferred public life to the ministry because I thought it offered a much finer opportunity for a robust, virile fight for a better life and a better world. I learned my trade as a compositor in a newspaper office, joined the union when I became a journeyman, aspired to and obtained honors of an exceptional character in the Labor Movement and in public life, and never deserted the front trenches in any movement to which I gave my support. My success in the Church was just as great during the years I was in its active work and, as a young man, honors were thrust upon me very fast. At the same time I was interested in sports, and whether it was football, baseball, foot-racing, or bicycle-racing, I gave the best that was in me to reach the goal of success.

If my opinion is worth anything concerning "What Labor Thinks of the Church" it is because I know something about these two great and powerful institutions. I found, however, that as my interest in the Labor Movement increased my interest in the Church decreased. This was because the results of my work in the Labor Movement were far more tangible than the results of my work in the Church. I found that the conditions which called for radical change, if the social and economic security of the people was going to be established, did not concern the Church. As an institution it was concerned in establishing an outlook upon life that would induce men to do the right, but if the right was not done there was very little distinction drawn between the wrong-doer and the right-doer. This lack of distinction did not apply so much to what were regarded as moral indiscretions as it did to the larger failures to recognize man's relationship to man in the industrial and commercial activities of life.

Labor's demand for "equality of opportunity" had a finer appeal to me than the Church's question, "Where will you spend eternity?" I was fascinated by the struggle for justice in the Trades Union Movement and the fight for coöperation in the Socialist Movement. To me the ideals of these two great working-class movements were the fulfillment of the moral and spiritual ideals planted in me by the Church. But I did not feel that the Church was working in that direction; it was more concerned in the uncertainties of life than it was in life's certainties. It is the same to-day as it was forty years ago. I felt that my grip upon a future life would be all the more secure if I was less concerned about devotions and more concerned about the realization of labor's programme of reforms. To me a confession of

faith in a living Christ by a moral and spiritual corpse had no appeal. I loved the men who were making a battle against the exploiters of the workers, the men and women who were attacking the cause of poverty rather than the results of poverty. These men and women were more concerned about the salvaging of human wrecks than they were about their own soul's salvation. They were building the New Jerusalem.

Labor thinks the Church is insincere. It believes the ministers of the Gospel are less inclined to make essential sacrifices for the advancement of their cause than the leaders of the Labor Movement are compelled to make because of the injustice of those who uphold the Church. They have vivid recollection of the dismissal of men from industries operated by so-called Christians because they exercise their right to organize for their own protection and advancement. They do not forget that men high in Church offices quite frequently throw off their mantle of Christianity when they enter the groups of employers parading under the name of Manufacturers' Association, Employers' Association, Open Shop Association, et cetera, and associate themselves with policies subversive of elementary Christian principles. They remember how these same men in an organized capacity appear before public bodies to demand reductions in wages when social workers are appealing to these same public bodies to liquidate liabilities incurred in buying milk to feed the underfed children of our large cities. The clashes between striking workmen and powerful corporations in Colorado, the brutal treatment of labor organizers in the coal areas of West Virginia, the child labor in the textile mills of the Southern States, and other festering wrongs perpetrated upon men and women by those in the favor of the

Church incite a resentment against the Church by the Labor Movement. True, this resentment is tempered by the action of the Church concerning the arrogant attitude of the United States Steel Trust toward its employees and the declarations of the Church in favor of a better social and industrial order.

Some years ago I read with great interest and profit that remarkable story by Dr. Charles M. Sheldon, *What Would Jesus Do?* That book has affected me a great deal and when elected to public positions its influence was with me. But what did I find by experience? I discovered that personal material gain, even among so-called Christian business men, was of far more importance than the accomplishing of some important reform bringing relief and satisfaction to thousands of men, women, and children. I discovered that the most important social reforms were those which deprived individuals or groups of individuals of some material privilege or concession, which, if sacrificed, would lighten the burden of thousands and spread benefits to unlimited numbers of people. To increase wages of civic or civil servants invites the opposition of manufacturers. To influence a city to buy its coal supplies direct from the mines instead of through the local coal dealers to effect demanded economies turns these same coal dealers into frenzied enemies of the man who proposes such a policy. To insist that the fair wages clauses in contracts be lived up to invites the uncompromising opposition of the unscrupulous contractor. To get the municipality the power to buy land and build houses to reduce the cost of living for the working man is a crime in the estimation of the real-estate manipulator and the building speculator. In fact, to do anything that ought to be done in the interests of the masses is sufficient grounds

for organized opposition at the next election. But where does the Church as an institution stand on these matters? Quite frequently it joins with all the selfish elements of society to crucify the men who silently and reverently resolve to project the Kingdom of God into the political activities of a city or nation. To-day the Church can present the peace-loving aspirations of the living Christ and to-morrow turn its pulpits into recruiting stations and its edifices into propaganda places for the war-mongering militarists. To-day it can present the hellish debauching influence of industries that fatten upon the appetites and weaknesses of men and women, and to-morrow it can sleep in blissful oblivion to the encroachments these same industries are making upon the gains of the moral and religious forces of society throughout a century. It is capable of exposing to the world the most malignant type of bitterness and hatred when theological, doctrinal, and dogmatic positions are challenged, and is guilty of inexcusably forgetting the virtues of human conduct which are recommended as the special attributes of the founder of the Church.

I remember a very important strike in which the men in the printing industry were involved. The means of arriving at an agreement between the employers and employees had not been exhausted, and apparently there had been no desire on the part of the employers' representatives to avail themselves of the machinery the union had provided to reach a settlement without resort to strike. A very large church publishing house, whose record had always been of the very best towards the union, joined with the employers to crush the organization of the employees. The book steward of this publishing house, who was an ordained minister, accepted the chairmanship of the Employers' Strike Committee.

The publishing house was used as the headquarters of the employers during the strike, notwithstanding the fact that among the strikers there were many men who, as members of the Church, had made their contributions to make possible the erection of the building. This publishing house is still one of the open-shop variety, although upwards of one hundred printing establishments in the city recognize the union and to-day are complying with the conditions laid down by the union. This same publishing house later tendered for the work of printing labels for the bottles of liquor which were to be sold throughout the Province under a system of Government Control of the liquor traffic, although the Church it represented was foremost in the fight for the total prohibition of the liquor traffic. It was only after a strong protest had been registered by prominent temperance workers that the tender was withdrawn. Such a policy as this does not inspire either confidence or respect.

Then again, Labor believes, rightly or wrongly, that the Church responds too willingly to the reactions of the prevailing industrial and economic order, and that it surrenders its authority as a great spiritual and moral force to the dictates of the wealth-owning class, with its material outlook on life. In my own experience covering twenty-seven years in the Labor Movement, twenty-four of which I have been manager and secretary-treasurer of a Labor Temple, I cannot help but feel that the average minister and the Church generally feels that it is stepping out of their legitimate sphere to interest themselves in the causes of strikes, lockouts, and industrial disturbances generally. It is an exceptional case for a minister to take a stand on the side of the workers, even when the issue between the employers and employees is a clear case of the former trying to enforce

conditions upon the latter which are unfair and inhuman. There are many situations I could describe in which the Church as an institution, and particularly its representatives, should have taken a leading part, but they were either tragically neutral or entirely indifferent. One case in particular was that involving a powerful corporation with a paid-up capital of millions of dollars, and six hundred female employees. This corporation had issued its new rules and regulations, affecting the conditions of these young girls and young women. They felt that to accept such conditions would be a severe tax upon their physical and mental capacities. As an organized body of workers they were helpless and at the mercy of the Company. They enlisted my support and were organized into a union. The Company immediately demanded their signatures to a document committing them to accept its terms or leave its service. The young women asked my advice. I ordered them to leave their positions immediately and they responded almost one hundred percent. Thus one of the essential public services of a great city was tied up. The Company turned its head offices into a restaurant and boarding house, drew upon its reserves of labor from country villages and towns, and would have succeeded in breaking the strike but for the prompt action of the present prime minister of Canada, who, at that time, was deputy minister of labor of Canada. Application was made for a Royal Commission to investigate the working conditions of these workers. The Cabinet appointed the Commission and a thorough investigation was made. The outstanding finding, in the many recommendations of the Commission, was that of the special Board of Physicians which co-operated with them, to the effect that if the Company had been permit-

ted to enforce their new rules and regulations the young women would have suffered such a physical and mental strain that they would have been "unfit for motherhood." A Labor official would naturally think that a situation of that kind would arouse the interest and command the assistance of the religious leaders, but the great victory was achieved without even a gesture of co-operation from that source. If a situation of that kind is not one in which the Church can fulfil the law of Christ, I would like to know what should enlist their sympathy and support. I am afraid it is only too true that the money-changers are still in the temple, but the lash of the Christ is bound about the bank roll. In other words, the Church has lost its leadership.

In making this indictment I know that its superficiality will be recognized in the light of the wonderful achievements of the Church in laying the foundations of millions of lives for useful service. I know that Labor will be reminded that it is not the function of the Church to take the side of either Capital or Labor, but to merely set forth a code of conduct which, if followed, will remove all friction between employer and employee. Labor is not satisfied with that position. It believes that the Church has a responsibility to the masses which, if recognized, will lead to the most searching analysis of the ethical and spiritual basis of the many systems of wealth production. Even at the present time Capitalism, Collectivism, Co-operation, Socialism, and Communism are competing with each other in the great industrial and economic struggle. The results of these systems vary considerably and their effects upon society are so clearly defined that it is not difficult for the Christian Church to determine which approximates most nearly an ideal founded upon the Word of Truth. One

suggestion will be sufficient to indicate the drift of this argument, and it is found in the fundamental difference between the results of the labors of the British Co-operators and the results of the labors of the powerful groups of financiers in both Great Britain and America, whose great achievement is the monopoly of credit and of wealth, with its destructive influence over the lives of millions of men, women, and children. In the case of the British Co-operators, industry is organized on the basis of co-operation, and the returns from collective endeavor are distributed equitably among millions of people; in the case of the modern goliaths of finance the mobilizations, manipulations, and monopolies of finance, industry, and commerce are the basis of an unjust, life-crushing, spirit-destroying, crime-encouraging, Christ-denying system. Surely, if this is the case, the Church can no longer remain neutral but must scourge the money-changers out of its temples.

I have read this to a woman whose daily conduct is the seal of her close communion with the Christ, and as I read the indictment she bowed her head in deep meditation, and then said: "There is so much of it that is only too true." And, as if to give her support, she cited an incident which had come to her attention only the day before, that of a young married man, employed by a so-called Christian employer, who, when complaining about a wage inadequate to support his wife and child, was reminded that if he didn't like it there were plenty of others willing to work for two dollars a week less.

I have no doubt that this Christian employer was feeling the injustice of the conditions fixed by the law of competition, and that his finer impulses would influence him to pay his employees a much higher wage than

he was paying them, but that to do so would handicap him in the race for success in the industrial world. This brings us back to the question of "systems," and if there is any one position in which the Church and Labor should present a united front it is in combating any industrial or financial system which cannot justify its existence in the light of Christian teaching.

But with all its faults, and with all its apparent indifference to the moral claim of Labor for its support, I am convinced that in the maintaining of a proper moral balance the world is more indebted to the Church than to any other organized institution. When it is willing to admit its indifference to the demand of Labor for a social and economic order based upon love and brotherhood, and when it is willing to declare to the world the immorality of one class of men and women exploiting another class of men and women to make profit out of their brain and physical power, the world's penitent bench will record a regeneration of great historic significance and humanity will rejoice in the new redemption.

BRITISH LABOR AND RELIGION

ARTHUR HENDERSON

Arthur Henderson, Home Secretary under Great Britain's first Labor government and Secretary of the British Labor Party, was born in Glasgow in 1863, though he is by long association a Northumbrian. After leaving school he was apprenticed to the iron-founding trade and became an active member of the Iron Founders' Union. Entering politics first as a Liberal, he held many responsible positions in local government. In 1905, after several earlier attempts, he successfully contested a division as a Labor candidate and entered the House of Commons, where he is now the senior member of the party. He very soon made his mark, and at the outbreak of war, when Mr. Ramsay MacDonald resigned, succeeded him as leader of the party in Parliament. In 1915 he accepted office in Mr. Asquith's first coalition government as president of the Board of Education, and under Mr. Lloyd George became a member of the War Cabinet. In this capacity he visited Russia in 1917, and what he saw there convinced him of the importance of the Stockholm Conference which Socialists of all countries proposed to call to discuss terms of peace. When passports were refused to the British delegates, he resigned, and thenceforth bent all his energies toward trying to bring about a peace by negotiation. In the "khaki" election of 1918, he, with many other Labor members, lost his seat, but was returned to the House at a bye-election in 1919.

As secretary of the Labor Party, Mr. Henderson had much to do with the new constitution which in June 1918 threw open its ranks to "all workers of hand and brain."

Mr. Henderson is a prominent Wesleyan Methodist, and early became known as a lay preacher. He was an active power also in the Brotherhood Movement, of which he was president in 1914-15.

He is noted in the party for his geniality and humane efficiency, and is affectionately known in the House of Commons as "Uncle Arthur."

In the years immediately preceding the World War, it was the custom of the Rev. Herbert Stead, M.A., Warden of the Browning Settlement in London, and brother of the late W. T. Stead, the distinguished editor of the *Review of Reviews,* to hold an annual Labour Week in which addresses were delivered by Labour

leaders on the subject of Labour and Religion. A student at the University of Zurich wrote to Mr. Stead: "Yesterday I finished reading the speeches of your latest Labour Week. I could not put the book down without great emotion. I had never thought it possible that the most radical Labour leaders would choose Jesus Christ as their guide and standard."

The surprise of this Zurich correspondent is easily appreciated when it is remembered that the Labour and Socialist Movements on the continent of Europe are largely anti-clerical and rationalist. But continental standards, which are not altogether appropriate as regards British Labour's political and economic philosophy, are still less appropriate in the matter of religion. This is to be explained in part by the historical development of the British Trade Union and Labour Movement, which has differed in important essentials from that of the Labour and Socialist Movement in Europe.

The rapid development of our industrial revolution during the nineteenth century, bringing in its train, as it did, formidable social problems such as poverty, slums, overcrowding, disease and accidents, insufficiency and wretchedness, and generally the degradation of masses of our people who were soon doomed to appalling conditions of life, created a situation which could not long be ignored either by the masses themselves, by the more enlightened statesmen of the nation, or by organised religion. The Evangelical Mission of John Wesley and his associates who broke away from the Established Church resulted in religion which hitherto had been largely interpreted as a conventional solace for the comfortable being taken to the masses, and a powerful non-conformist movement, more popular in its scope and activities than had been the Established

Church, began to grow up. It was primarily from this section of the community that the very early pioneers of trade unionism were drawn. It is not without interest, for example, to mention the best-known episode of early trade unionism—the trial and transportation of the six Dorchester labourers in 1834. Sidney and Beatrice Webb, in their *History of Trade Unionism,* tell us that "the trial of these unfortunate labourers was a scandalous perversion of the law . . . not only were they guiltless of any intimidation or outrage, but they had not even struck or presented any application for higher wages. Yet the judge . . . inflicted upon them, after the briefest of trials, the monstrous sentence of seven years' transportation," and so for their efforts to establish a friendly society of agricultural labourers the two brothers Lovelace and their friends "who seemed to have been simple-minded Methodists, two of them being itinerant preachers," were transported to a convict settlement. It was men of this type more than of any other—men of simple faith and imbued with courage and spirit of sacrifice, which distinguished the early Christians—who laid the foundations of the British Trade Union Movement, despite grossly unjust legal prohibitions, the threat of severe legal penalties, and the hostility and prejudice of the various established and organised authorities.

While these pioneers had to carry on their efforts to commence and develop working-class industrial organisations under the constant threat of iniquitous laws that were rigorously enforced and, for the most part, ignored by the churches when not actually opposed and denounced by them, a goodly number of the pioneers themselves were actively and ardently associated with organised religion. The harsh and degrading accom-

paniments of the industrial revolution compelled them to organise for their own protection and for that of their fellow workers. They did more. The growing pressure of these terrible conditions forced sections of the Established Church and of the non-conformist churches to realise that on the one hand the conventional interpretation of religion was disastrously inadequate, and on the other hand that the Evangelical message, while stressing personal salvation, did not lay sufficient emphasis on social regeneration, and gradually the social implications of religion began to be more and more recognised and understood. From the Anglican Church came the humanitarianism of Shaftesbury, Wilberforce and others, and later the still wider conceptions of Kingsley, Maurice and other Christian Socialists. The more intimate contact of the non-conformist groups with the working masses had more important effects still and produced during the last quarter of the nineteenth century that robust and radical nonconformity which was the most powerful religious force in England and the best modern expression of the Church militant. The churches had begun to realise that it was not sufficient to be concerned almost exclusively with the divine spark in man, and that they must also care for the human temple in which the spark was enshrined. They began to lay greater stress on the social implications of the Christian religion, and to expound the social teachings of the Gospel in relation to the everyday facts of life. These important developments in the thought and outlook of the churches were taking place side by side with the gradual establishment and development of the Trade Union Movement. Social and industrial evils demanded and received greater attention. Protective industrial legislation, improved

social conditions, the status of the producer in industry, the political rights of the workers, popular education, and many other kindred subjects loomed up large on the horizon and began to receive more sympathetic consideration than ever before, and what has been called the problem of the condition of the people was brought to the very forefront and gradually became the most insistent and urgent issue confronting the statesmen. The agency chiefly concerned in bringing about this change was undoubtedly the growing Trade Union Movement, aided in their own special spheres of influence by radical non-conformity, the Christian Socialists, and the more forward-looking elements of orthodox religion generally.

When I first became a member of the Trade Union Movement, close upon fifty years ago, the majority of the leaders locally and nationally were actively engaged in religious work as lay-preachers, church deacons, Sunday-school superintendents and teachers, Bible-class teachers, Band of Hope workers, etc. In my own early experiences as a lay-preacher in the Wesleyan Methodist connection, I found in all parts of the country that many of the most active religious workers were often also the most influential leaders of the local trade-union branches. Thus it is that an explanation is to be found of the fact that the spirit of the British Trade Union Movement has its roots firmly embedded in the soil of religion, and that the Movement differs in this respect very markedly from similar movements in other parts of the world.

The political Labour Movement, which developed out of the Trade Union Movement, and drew the majority of its early Parliamentary leaders from it, received much of its driving force and inspiration from

radical non-conformity. It is a demonstrable fact that the bulk of the members of the Parliamentary Labour Party in any given time during the last twenty-five years had graduated into their wider sphere of activity via the Sunday school, the Bible class, the temperance society, or the pulpit. No British political party has ever had such a large proportion of lay-preachers and Sunday-school teachers in its ranks as has the Labour Party in Parliament, and even today, despite the increased pressure of their public duties, many of them continue still their religious activities in one form or another. All the various manifestations of organised endeavour to promote the spiritual and social well-being of the people have found some of their most successful and powerful advocates among the active leaders of the Labour Movement, including Labour Members of Parliament and national and local trade-union officials.

The chief founder of the political Labour Party was the late Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., the best loved by all the masses of all the leading personalities associated with the British working-class movement. Hardie was the great missionary of Labour, a man inspired by genuine affection for and sincere faith in the humble, common people. Publicly proclaiming his own unquenchable spiritual faith at the height of his own power and influence, Keir Hardie declared, "If I were a thirty years' younger man, with the experience I have gained during the past thirty-five years, I would methinks abandon house and home, wife and child if need be, to go forth among the people to proclaim afresh and anew the full message of the Gospel of Jesus of Nazareth." The present leader of Labour declared in 1913: "The Labour Movement must have its religious roots: the Religious Movement must have its Labour top shoots.

You cannot divide one from the other, cannot divide humanity up. Therefore, according to my views and experience, those who are going to stand by when the foul weather comes, and the storms beat, and the hard work has got to be done, are the men and women who believe in God, who believe that they are the mere instrument of some magnificent Power, not controlled like dead things by that Power, but inspired by that Power to work its will and to realise its purposes." Thus spoke the founder of the British Labour Party, and the first Labour Prime Minister, the most typical representative of that blend of workers by hand and by brain which is the Labour Movement in its broader sense today.

British Labour is not hostile to religion. On the contrary, Labour faith shares with religion common springs of inspiration and of hope. Such indifference among the masses as can be found is, in my opinion, an indifference rather to the institution of religion than to religion itself and springs not from any inherent antagonism to the churches, but from the failure of the churches in the past to understand the full scope of their mission and the full content of their message. Labour stands not merely for the improvement of the material conditions of the people, but for their spiritual and cultural self-expression, for a fuller opportunity for the individual to cultivate and utilise all his God-given faculties and qualities, his energies and powers. Labour is concerned not only with social and economic reconstruction, but also with personal development and personal regeneration. For while it holds that man cannot live without bread, it is fully conscious of the truth that man cannot live by bread alone. In short, it stands for the practical application of the principles of the Christian

Church and the realisation of human brotherhood in the fullest possible measure.

There is no antagonism, no conflict, no inherent fundamental divergence between the aims and aspirations of Labour and the ideals and purposes of religion, no essential difference or disharmony between Labour's conception of human arrangements and the Christian conception of God's Kingdom on earth. What Labour would destroy or remove or transform are the very things in social and personal life which are contrary to and violations of the Christian ideals. It seems to me that the Labour Movement and the Churches must always be united on this great central aim: to realise the highest attainable form of society and the noblest type of individual citizen. This was recognised by the Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship promoted in 1924 by the churches and based on "the conviction that the Christian faith, rightly interpreted and consistently followed, gives the vision and the power essential for solving the problems of today, that the social ethics of Christianity have been greatly neglected by Christians with disastrous consequences to the individual and to society, and that it is of the first importance that they should be given a clearer and more persistent emphasis. In the teaching and work of Jesus Christ there are certain fundamental principles—such as the universal Fatherhood of God with its corollary that mankind is God's family, and the law 'that whoso loseth his life, findeth it'—which, if accepted, not only condemns much in the present organisation of society, but shows the way of regeneration. Christianity has proved itself to possess also a motive power for the transformation of the individual, without which no change of policy or method can succeed. In the lights

of its principles the constitution of society, the conduct of industry, the upbringing of children, national and international politics, the personal relations of men and women, in fact all human relationships, must be tested."

Fundamentally, Labour aims and religion are identical, though the Church and the Labour Movement must necessarily pursue each its own work in its own appropriate way, sometimes in active coöperation, more often separately, but always in a spirit of mutual trust, sympathy and understanding. For theirs is a common task, as was admirably set forth in a Memorial presented to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald by several hundred priests of the Church of England, who stated:

> Our particular calling, with its pastoral experience, gives us direct knowledge of the sufferings and deprivations mental, moral and physical to which millions of our fellow citizens are subject in our present social and industrial order, and to find a remedy for which is the chief purpose and aim of the Labour Movement. It is therefore a matter of great satisfaction to us that this increased opportunity is open to find you in the great assembly of the nation, and we shall support actively, in whatever ways are legitimately open to us, the efforts you assuredly will make for the spiritual and economic emancipation of the people.

The identity of aim and the growing understanding between the Christian Church and Labour serve, however, to throw into relief the comparative inability of the former to attract large multitudes of the latter into active membership. I have mentioned that only too frequently a distinction is made between the institutions of religion and religion itself, and that much of the criticism directed against the churches does not touch religion itself in any way. It may be, as I think it is,

that in the past the churches failed grievously in their exposition of religion, that their interpretation was often narrow and imperfect, and that they were for the most part slow to appreciate and to understand the surgings of mind and the deeper aspirations of the then inarticulate masses. They failed to discern the inevitable march towards democracy, and democracy was well in the making before the churches had readjusted themselves into an attitude of understanding and sympathy. And though they may not have forfeited to any large extent their moral and spiritual leadership of the people, their popular influence and prestige did not expand in proportion to and at the rate of the evolution towards democracy. This fact accounts in no small measure for the gulf that has come to exist between large sections of the working population and the churches—to their mutual loss and disadvantage.

The churches, whatever may be said regarding their old-time imperfect presentation of Christianity, are the greatest and most powerful moral and spiritual schools that the world has known, whose first and chief object is to produce Christian character; and the problem of character must always be of deep concern to the leaders of democracy. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald once candidly confessed that he could see no hope for the people, for the future, "unless we could appeal to the *character* of the people; unless, first of all, character was established like a bulwark in our midst. It alone was the refuge and protection of those of us who have to stand for Democracy and fight its uphill fights—often with some who should be our followers lagging behind."

There are multitudes who wish to see the Christian Church operating as the insistent Conscience of Society, directing the Social Crusade, and occupying that position

of moral and spiritual leadership without which Democracy can never achieve its greatest and ultimate ends. The Christian religion is not a mere bundle of pious abstractions or comfortable platitudes; it is a code of vital principles, of moral standards and spiritual ideals, which were intended to govern all forms of mass relationships and every department of personal life; and I believe that only in so far as the Christian Church seeks to express and to apply religion in this practical way will it achieve the highest pinnacle of moral influence and spiritual power, and retain within itself the enlightened leadership of struggling mankind.

BRITISH SOCIALISTS AND THE CHURCH

A. FENNER BROCKWAY

The Political Secretary of the Independent Labor Party in England is a man of unique personality and ability. He was born on November 1, 1888, in Calcutta, India. His father was a minister. He graduated from Eltham College in London. He was editor of *The Labor Leader* from 1911 to 1916. At the outbreak of the war he opposed British entry, believing it was not the way to win freedom and liberty for the people. He was honorary secretary of the Non-Conscription Fellowship from 1916 to 1920, secretary of the British Committee on Indian National Congress in 1920, and for the next two years joint secretary of the Prison Inquiry Committee. In 1922 he became organizing secretary for the Independent Labor Party. His absolute sincerity and devotion to the principles of peace are proved by the fact that he served twenty-nine months in prison after having been tried nine times during the war under the Defense of the Realm Act. He is a master in the art of writing pamphlets for popular reading. During the war he wrote a play describing the tragedy of war, called *Devil's Business,* which was suppressed by the government. In 1918, while in prison, he wrote *The Recruit.* With Stephen Hobhouse he jointly wrote the work on *English Prisons Today.* At present he is also serving as the editor of *The New Leader,* probably the best labor periodical in Great Britain.

In what I am writing here I express my own views, but I think they represent the views of many British Socialists. We have no antagonism to Christianity and have a real reverence for the teaching and life of Christ, but we find no satisfaction or inspiration in the Church. The hymns of the Church are obsolete; the sermons are very rarely worth listening to; the forms of worship are unrelated to life, and such inspiration as comes from the devotion and beauty of some church services and buildings can be found even more intimately and fully in the silences and beauty of nature.

There is also the additional practical point that most Socialist propaganda in Great Britain is carried out on Sundays, and Socialist activities during the week prevent association with the week-day activities of church life.

At the same time we recognise that a great change is coming over the Church. Many of the Non-conformist churches, and particularly the Primitive Methodist Church, are becoming democratic and the working-class membership is largely Labour where before it was Liberal. The Non-conformist Church, as a whole, however, is still dominated by rich Liberals, and Socialists find little that is sympathetic in fellowship with them.

In the Church of England, the Anglo-Catholic movement tends towards Socialism, and many Socialists, whilst they do not follow what they regard as the superstition of the ritualism, appreciate its beauty and communal significance.

Another factor which Socialists are beginning to realise is that missionary activity in other countries is ceasing to be in defence of Imperialism and is increasingly becoming a defence of Native interests. The declaration of the recent conference of missionaries in Jerusalem is only concentrated evidence of indications which have come from many parts of the world during the last few years.

We welcome this approach of the Church to the ideals of Labour because, as has often been pointed out, the ethics of Socialism and Christianity are identical.

LABOR THINKS LITTLE OF THE CHURCH

GEORGE LANSBURY

George Lansbury, the picturesque and turbulent Labor member for Poplar Borough and one of the most individual figures in the British Labor Movement to-day, was born in Suffolk in 1859. He was by nature a rebel and before he was twenty was making speeches in support of the Radical Movement in the East End of London. He was one of the earliest members of the Social Democratic Federation. Dissatisfied with conditions in England, at twenty-five he emigrated to Australia, but returned the next year to Poplar in the East End of London, where he has lived and worked ever since. He is sometimes known as "the king of Poplar" and has held practically every office in the local government of the Borough.

In 1910 he was elected to parliament but resigned two years later to fight the seat on the suffrage issue and was defeated. He protested strongly against the treatment of the suffragettes by the law and was himself imprisoned for his utterances on the subject. He went on a hunger strike, and after some days was released.

Mr. Lansbury is perhaps best known in connection with the *Daily Herald,* Great Britain's only Labor daily, which he helped to found in 1912. He served as editor from 1913 to 1922, and under his leadership it was a lively and exuberant journal, the organ of an energetic trade unionism.

In 1921 he again served a term in prison with other members of the Poplar Borough Council for refusing to levy taxes for certain services until the cost of relief for unemployment was paid by rates levied on richer London.

In 1922 he founded *Lansbury's Labour Weekly* with its slogan of "Socialism in our time," which helped to prepare the way for the new industrial militancy observable in the British Labor Movement. He is the author of many books and pamphlets, among them *What I Saw in Russia, Your Part in Poverty,* and *The Miracle of Fleet Street*—a history of the *Daily Herald.*

ORDINARY working people in Britain think very little about the churches, or about religion. Not that they can be said to be hostile to either, but simply because for huge masses of our people the churches do not exist.

There never was a time when attendance at Sunday school, church, meeting house or chapel was as irregular and sparse as now. It is true that in every great city, such as London, Manchester and Glasgow, certain preachers draw big congregations because of their special gifts of preaching. In the main, though, most places of public worship are over large for the number of people desirous of attending.

Even in South Wales and parts of England where Non-conformity formerly held sway, attendance at Sunday services has fallen away. Because this is so, we shall, however, make a great mistake if we imagine the British nation has become a nation of atheists or even agnostics. It is mainly indifference which accounts for the present condition of affairs. This is proved by the fact that attacks on religion are not tolerated. People who never enter a place of worship will work themselves up to a fine frenzy in defence of Christianity if the fundamentals of the faith are attacked.

Many years ago a friend of mine, when canvassing in an East London slum for a school-board candidate who advocated "secular education" and the prohibition of religious instruction in all State-aided schools, was greeted with the remark: "These are the blighters who want to rob us of our *bloody* religion." The lady who expressed herself in such vehement language had probably been to church when she was christened and married and would not go again till the burial service was read over her. Yet, somehow, she thought religion or the church was something worth preserving and defending, even in the rather lurid manner mentioned.

Where there is definite, clear-cut opposition to churches and religion, that is, where men attack the clergy and their teaching, such attacks do not usually

take the form which was the custom when I was a young man forty years ago. In those days, men like Charles Bradlaugh, Professor Huxley and others ruthlessly attacked the whole basis of the Christian faith and belief in the supernatural; controversies of this sort involving questions as to existence or non-existence of a Deity or Supreme Being are long since dead. A generation ago these were live questions which divided families and friends into hostile, bitter camps. There are, of course, still many among us who hold the same sort of views, but they are less vocal and aggressive than in the days of which I speak. Opposition to the churches has taken a new form. There is no eagerness now to demonstrate the impossibility of the existence of a Deity. No one now calls in question the virgin birth or asks, "Where did Cain get his wife?" or "How could a whale possibly swallow Jonah?"—and this, largely because the churches themselves have modified their teaching on these and other difficult subjects. To-day, people feel instinctively that what is known as the spiritual side of life is something which is part of each individual man or woman's life, and that communion with God is not dependent on an altar or fine building, but is something which springs spontaneously from human consciousness; and what is most important of all, people now understand that no two people ever pass through exactly the same spiritual experiences.

The most vital opposition to the churches comes from those who think about life in an all-round sort of manner, that is, from those who are unable to accept the doctrine that spiritual life is one compartment and that ordinary life of the everyday world of work and play is another. I have already said that the mass of people do not trouble one way or the other except when a baby is

to be christened or somebody is to be married or buried, but those who criticise start from the assumption that religion is something which should help us to *live* and not merely prepare us for *death*. In fact, many men and women in the British Labour Movement hold most strongly the belief that Socialism is the practical application to daily life of the principles of Christianity. Such people look on the Carpenter's Son as the first of the martyrs on behalf of the cause of human progress, brotherhood and solidarity. They cannot accept the commonplace teaching of those paid servants of the Christian Church, bishops and others, who tell us *the Sermon on the Mount is not practical and the fulfilment of religion will be found in heaven.*

The late war destroyed many hoary-headed lies and vain illusions. Few among us now believe in the "God of Battles." No true follower of the Jesus of history or any of those who accept the teachings of the early Fathers of the Church think it possible the Founder of our Faith could ever be found driving an aeroplane in the skies in order to bomb women, children and men, or even flocks and herds, as is done in Mesopotamia and elsewhere in the East, or sailing beneath the sea, launching torpedoes against shiploads of human beings. Neither can such faithful ones imagine Jesus or Paul or John or Peter ordering armies and fleets to surround whole nations and deny them the means to live through the operation of blockade or *Cordon Sanitaire*. The Great War put Christian against Christian, Catholic against Catholic, Protestant against Protestant: both sides prayed to God for help to overcome their enemies. We all know that victory came to the strongest side—the side with most man-power, money and up-to-date armaments. No Christian can possibly accept the blas-

phemous notion that it is God's will that man should invent poison gas or spend time and energy inventing the hellish machinery of tanks and caterpillars and all the latest destructive devices of hell itself.

Padres, the Y. M. C. A., and other organisations did great work providing amusements, cigarettes, et cetera, behind the lines, and cheering, consoling and helping the wounded and dying during the war; nothing will ever wipe out the memory of this sort of work at home and abroad. But such kindly acts do not Christianise the paganism of war, because war cannot under any circumstances be anything other than bestial and horrible. Men who came back and told what war is like laid bare to wives and children, mothers and sweethearts, what a foul, horrible business it is. Consequently, today, thinking men and women consider it a blasphemy to mix the name of God and religion with such a devilish business. Millions of people know now what before 1914 they only read about: they know that what Sherman said is true—"War is Hell"—and therefore is in direct conflict and opposition to all the teaching of Him who came to do the will of His Father, and who told us His Father's will was that "not one of these little ones should perish."

Therefore, men who from 1914 to 1918 saw the churches of all denominations taking part in recruiting, in singing hymns of war and offering prayers to a God of War, revolt against such a travesty of Christ's teaching. Even now, with all the experience of the past thirteen years, the churches do not as an organised body declare against war. There is a feeling amongst the masses that if war comes again the churches will, as in the past, line up with the devil and forsake their Master and His teachings.

In the same way workmen in Britain see work-a-day life organised as a class struggle and the accepted basis of life as competition. Men can rise only on stepping stones made out of the lives and failures of their fellows. Do not imagine that everybody has an equal chance to rise. No such thing! No matter what our great captains of industry may say, there is not room at the top for all, because without a base or foundation there could be no top. Man has encircled the globe in such a manner that our voices travel through space and are heard at the ends of the earth. Soon our faces will accompany our words; we sail under and over the seas, span huge tracts of water with marvellous bridges, tunnel through mighty rocks and beneath huge mountains, but as yet have not solved the problem of how to provide life in all its fulness for all the children of men.

Civilised Christian nations draw on the natural resources of those described as heathen, utilise slave and serf labour to bring spices, ivory, rubber and foodstuffs from the ends of the earth, *and still the civilised nations live at home and abroad in a state of war.* Out of the abundance man produces proceed poverty, penury and want, and accompanying these are periodical outbreaks of war, pestilence and plague. Churches tell us these things must be dealt with by economists, statesmen and politicians. Those who, like myself, wish to preserve our faith in Christ's religion as taught and expressed by Himself in the Gospels, cannot accept this sort of teaching as final. We cannot believe that, in such a world as this in which we live, it is either Christian, moral, or even human that people should be forced to labour and toil and in return live lives of penury and want, while others, a tiny minority, live in luxury, pomp

and affluence. We do not believe that amassing wealth is or ought to be the aim and object of living, whether practised by an individual or by a nation.

We think the time has come for a new statement of religion. We do not ask for a new religion: the old one expressed in the words, "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you," is good enough for us, but we want it translated into deeds. Years ago I was asked, "Why don't people accept religion? why don't the masses go to Church?" *I said then, as I say now: they, the masses, believe we Christians do not believe what we say we believe.* This is, I am sure, true of those who think about the question. How can any of us who kneel at the Communion Table as brothers and sisters in the sight of God, accepting the teaching of the oneness of human life, how can we defend war? How can we defend competition for bread and all its horrors from slumdom and unemployment to destitution and pauperism? How many of us ever stay to enquire why it is said of Jesus the common people heard Him gladly, and why it is the multitude do not follow our bishops, priests and clergy about from place to place and gladly listen to their message. Years ago I was on a religious committee: we were a mixed lot—peers and business men, bishops and workmen. One day, as is not unusual, I made a speech pleading for action; a noble marquis replied to me saying, "If we should do what Mr. Lansbury asks us to do we would be charged with turning the world upside down." I reminded his lordship that Paul and Silas and other disciples were indeed locked up and charged with doing that very thing, and expressed the opinion that when the leaders of religion were in as dead earnest as our Lord Himself, I had no

doubt at all they would be arrested and executed on the spot.

The common people of today want from all of us who write and speak to them a plain common-sense message such as Jesus gave; they also want the same application. When people were sick He cured them; when halt, blind and lame He healed them; when hungry He fed them; when little children were hustled and driven away He gathered them in His arms and rebuked those who chased them away; when He spoke for the down-and-outs, the out-of-works, He claimed for the last the same pay as for the first. He knew men's wives and families needed the same measure of food, whether the bread-winner could work a full day or part of one.

In this parable He founded the doctrine, "Work or maintenance." When charged with mixing up with sinners, He kept on His way, simply reproving the self-righteous; when a woman was taken in adultery, He did not call for a "scarlet letter" but cried out to the gaping, self-righteous crowd, "He who is without sin let him cast the first stone," and all were silent as death. There never was or has been since such an understandable Teacher. The churches have very effectively hidden, covered up, His great teachings with a cloud of words called theology. Ordinary people who can read understand the words he uttered to mean what ordinary people would have them mean, if they used the words and sentences themselves.

Knowing these things, trying to understand the kind of life led by Him whom we know of as "The Light of the World," we, who in Britain belong to the Labour Movement and preserve our faith in God and religion, refuse under every circumstance to accept war as justifiable, right, or in accordance with the principles of life

and conduct laid down by Him to whose memory cathedrals and churches have been erected. Neither can we accept man-made poverty as anything else but a crime against His teaching. We cannot accept the plea that God created rich and poor. We know all babies born are just flesh and blood and are the same whether born in London or Timbuctoo. We want the millennium here and now. When told to think of a future life our answer is that the best preparation for another existence is so to live, so to labour, as to strive to the fullest extent to make ourselves worthy citizens of whatever world of spirits the future may have in store for us.

Finally, we refuse to accept man-made misery, destitution and crime as the will of God. We refuse to believe that in the midst of plenty anyone should starve. We know mankind has reached the stage when the problem of production has been solved, that all we need now is to discover how best to share what the profligacy of science and nature gives us. We believe this will be solved when mankind understands that neither abundance nor niggardliness is what men need: sufficiency will supply all we crave for. Let us each try to learn the truth taught by Ruskin, that the richest man could not sit at his feast unless blindfolded by ignorance, and with Ruskin let us raise the veil boldly and face the light—the light which illumines the solemn, sacred truth that the fulness of life is service, and happiness is impossible except for those who, like the Author and Giver of our faith, lived a life of sharing and went about proclaiming in language that will never die the futility of war, of nationalism, and of selfishness; who taught us also that there is no God of the British, no God of the Americans, but one God, Father of the whole human race; that because this is so all killing is murder, all slavery

is an enslavement of brothers; and that true salvation is impossible for either individuals or nationalities, but can become a reality only when the world of mankind has forgotten custom houses and frontiers and is bound together in the bonds of international fraternity.

BOURGEOIS AND COMMUNIST MORALITY [1]

VLADIMIR ILYITCH ULIANOV (LENIN)

Vladimir Ilyitch Ulianov was born in 1871 in Simbirsk, where his father was a director of the People's Schools. The boy was a brilliant student and on leaving high school was awarded a gold medal for his proficiency. When he was seventeen his elder brother was hanged for participation in a plot against the Czar and this event profoundly influenced the life of Lenin. He went on to the university but was promptly expelled for joining a student organization. Being refused readmission a year later, he applied to study abroad, but this too was denied, and he studied law by himself and in 1891 was admitted to the bar.

At St. Petersburg he, with several other Marxists, formed a Workers' circle which became very active in agitation and in distributing leaflets prepared by Lenin. In 1895 the leaders were arrested and Lenin sent to prison. Later he was exiled to Siberia, where he lived for three years. In 1900 he was freed, but the activity of the police made it impossible for him to remain in Russia and he went to Switzerland, and later to France. To avoid the authorities, he assumed many names and will go down in history under one of them, Lenin. In Paris he helped to edit *The Spark,* and in 1903 when the party split into Bolshevik (majority) and Menshevik (minority) he led the majority. Following this he started his own paper, *Forward.* In 1905 during the abortive revolution he returned to Russia for a brief period, but was again forced to leave. For the next ten years he lived abroad, where he edited various Bolshevik journals and gradually strengthened and solidified the majority wing.

During the war he was active in the Zimmerwald conference of Socialists, where he led the Left group. In 1917, after the Revolution, he returned to Russia and was everywhere at Workers' Party conferences, speaking strongly in favor of immediate steps for peace, confiscation of factories, and confiscation of the land by the peasants. He was finally forced to leave the country again and directed the Soviet seizure of power from Finland.

His career since then is a matter of Russian history. Under his leadership the Bolsheviks defeated the armies of intervention and counter-revolution, and established a solid government. In 1924, after several severe illnesses, Lenin died on January 21.

[1] An extract from an address given by Lenin before the Communist League of Youth (Comsomols) not long before his death.

YOU must educate yourselves into being communists. The problem of our League of Youth is to arrange its practical activities so that youth may educate itself. This must be done while organizing, solidifying, and struggling. The work of raising, educating, and teaching our youth must consist in inculcating in them the communist morality.

But is there a communist morality? Does a communist ethics exist? Of course it does. It is often imagined that we have no morality of our own, and the bourgeoisie frequently accuse us, communists, of rejecting all forms of morality. This is only a method of deception: it is throwing sand into the eyes of the workers and peasants.

In what sense do we reject morality and ethics? In the sense in which the bourgeoisie preach it—a morality derived from the commands of God. As to this, of course we claim that we do not believe in God. We know very well that the clergy, the bourgeoisie, and the landowners all spoke in the name of God in order to further their exploiting interests. We know that they derived their morality either from the "commands of God" or from some idealistic phrases which always led to something very similar to the "commands of God." We reject any such morality, which is taken from outside humanity, from outside class consciousness. We say that it is deceit: it is cheating, clogging up the minds of workers and peasants for the profit of landowners and capitalists.

We assert that our morality is fully subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat.

Our morality has originated from the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. The old society was based upon the oppression of all workers and peasants

by landowners and capitalists. We had to destroy this society, to overthrow the oppressors, and for that purpose we had to form a union. God could not create such a union: only factories and mills, only a proletariat, awakened and aroused after a long sleep, could create it. Only when this class had been formed did the movement of the masses begin—the movement which, as we now see, led to the victory of a proletarian revolution in one of the weakest countries, after defending itself from the attack of the bourgeoisie of the whole world for three long years.

We see how the proletarian revolution is growing throughout the whole world. We speak now, on the basis of experience, that only the proletariat could have created such a united force (including a split-up and dusty peasant class), which has withstood the attacks of the exploiters. Only such a class can help the labouring masses to unite, to solidify, to withstand its enemies, to strengthen decisively the communist society; only such a class can help to complete its construction.

That is why we say that the morality which is not based on the needs of human society does not exist for us, that such morality is a fraud. Again we say that from our point of view morality is subordinate to the class struggle of the proletariat.

What does the class struggle consist of? It consists of overthrowing the Czar, in overthrowing the capitalists, and in destroying the capitalist class.

If one part of society appropriates all the land, we have a class of landowners and another class of peasants; if one part of society owns the factories and mills, possesses all the bonds and capital, and another part works in the factories, that creates a class of capitalists and another of the proletariat.

It was not difficult to banish the Czar—it required only a few days. It was not very difficult to banish the landowners—it was done in a few months. It is also not very difficult to banish the capitalists. But to abolish class distinction is incomparably more difficult. There still remains a division into workers and peasants. When a peasant, owning a separate piece of land, appropriates some surplus grain—that is, grain which he or his cattle do not need—while all the others are in want, such a peasant becomes an exploiter. It is profitable for him to retain more bread, while others suffer hunger: "The more they starve, the better I will be able to sell bread at a higher price."

It is necessary that all should work according to a common plan, on a common soil, in common factories and mills, and according to common regulations. Is this easily done? You see that here a solution is not as easy to achieve as it is to banish the Czar, the landowners, and the capitalists. It is necessary that the proletariat should re-educate, re-instruct, some of the peasants, win over the peasant-labourers, in order to destroy the opposition of the rich peasants, those who profit through the needs of the rest.

This means that the proletarian struggle is not completed by the overthrow of the Czar and the banishment of the landowners and the capitalists. The class struggle continues—it has only changed its form. It is the class struggle of the proletariat to unite in one union the split-up masses of the ignorant peasant class.

The class struggle continues. Our task is to subordinate all interests to this fight. And we subordinate our communist morality to this task. We assert that morality is that which serves to demolish the old exploiting society and to unite all working people about the proletariat, thus creating a new society of communists.

Communist morality is the one which serves to unite all workers against any exploitation, against any kind of small ownership, because small ownership puts into the hands of one person that which was created by the labour of the whole society. With us land is considered common property; but if I take a certain piece out of this common property, produce on it twice as much bread as I need, then I speculate with the surplus. If I reason thus—"The more hungry people there are, the better prices I'll get"—do I act as a communist should? No, rather as an exploiter and property-owner. Against this we must struggle.

The old society was founded on the principle that either you rob your neighbour or he robs you, either you work for another or he works for you, either you are the slave-owner or you yourself are the slave. It is apparent that anyone educated in such a society imbibes with his mother's milk, so to speak, the psychology, the habit, the understanding, that he must either be a slave-owner or a slave, a small proprietor, a small employee, a clerk, or an intellectual—in a word, that he must care only for his own property, his own position, and for nothing else. "If I am only the master of this piece of land, I do not care about anything else. If another will starve, all the better—I shall sell my bread at a higher price! If I have my little position as a physician, an engineer, a teacher, or an employee, I don't care about anybody else! Perhaps, by being hypocritical, pleasing those in power, I can keep my little place and may even be able to push forward further and become a bourgeois!" . . . For a communist to have such a psychology and such an attitude is impossible.

When the workers and the peasants proved that we could defend ourselves with our own force and create a new society, then the new communist education began

—the education acquired in the struggle against exploiters, the education acquired through the union with the proletariat, against egotists and small property-owners, in the struggle against that psychology and those habits which say: "I wish to gain my own profit, I do not care about the rest."

Here is the answer to the question as to how the young growing generation ought to learn communism. It can learn communism only by linking each step of its study, its education, with an uninterrupted struggle of proletarians and working people against the old exploiting society. When they speak to us about morality we say: "For the communist all morality consists in this unified, solid discipline and conscious mass struggle against the exploiters. We do not believe in the 'eternal' morality; we expose the deceit of all the fairy tales about such a morality. Our morality serves to raise the level of human society higher, serves to abolish the exploitation of labour." To realize this, a generation of youth is needed which will transform itself into understanding conscious beings in an environment of disciplined, desperate struggle with the bourgeoisie. In this struggle it will produce real communists. Study and education must be subordinated and linked at each step in this struggle.

The education of the communist youth must not consist in all kinds of pleasing speeches and rules of morality. When men saw how their fathers and mothers lived under the oppression of the landowners and capitalists, when they themselves participated in the sufferings which fell upon those who began the struggle against exploiters, when they saw the sacrifices it cost to continue this struggle and to defend that which they conquered, when they saw what a furious enemy the

landowners and the capitalists were, then these people, existing in such an environment, educated themselves into communists.

The basis of communist morality is the struggle to strengthen and complete communism itself. To be members of the League of Youth means to conduct its activities in such a manner that all its work, its strength, is devoted to the common task. This is what communist education consists of. Only in such work does the young man or young woman become a real communist. One becomes a communist only when he has achieved some practical result.

The Communist League of Youth must be a hard-hitting group, which aids in all kinds of tasks, which shows its initiative and which "starts" things. The League must be such that any worker can see in it men whose teaching he perhaps does not understand, in whose teaching he perhaps cannot believe immediately, but whose practical work, whose activity, shows him that these really are the men who point for him the right way. As the Communist Manifesto says:

> The conditions of living of the old order are already destroyed in the living conditions of the proletariat. The proletarian owns no property; his relations to his wife and children have nothing in common with the family relations of the bourgeoisie. Modern industrial labour, the present burden of capital—which exists in England, in France, in America, and in Germany—have erased from the proletarian all traces of national character. Laws, morality, religion are to him nothing more than bourgeois prejudices, under which either this or that interest is concealed.

THE SIGNIFICANCE AND THE METHODS OF ANTI-RELIGIOUS PROPAGANDA

LEON D. TROTZKY

There are few more dramatic careers in history than that of Trotzky. Born in 1879, in Kherson, he quickly became one of the leaders of the labor movement in Russia. While still in high school in Nikolayev, he was introduced into revolutionary circles and upon graduation became a leader among the workers of that city. The organization developed rapidly under the name of the Workers' Union of Southern Russia, publishing *Our Work* illegally. In 1898 Trotzky was arrested and, after having been dragged from one prison to another, was finally exiled to Siberia. In 1902 he escaped from his imprisonment, subsequently taking an active part as contributor to the *Spark,* which was then being published in London. The outbreak of the revolution of 1905 found Trotzky as a member of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet. When the entire Soviet was arrested and sentenced to exile, Trotzky was among those condemned. In 1907 he escaped a second time and afterward continued his revolutionary activity in various European countries.

At the outbreak of the World War he was editing *Our Word* in Paris. Because of his internationalistic attitude he was considered a dangerous propagandist and was deported by the government from France to Spain and again imprisoned. He was finally released on condition that he would leave the country. He went to the United States, where he became editor of the Russian newspaper, *New World.*

The revolution of 1917 brought him back to Russia, although en route he was imprisoned in Canada. He was elected chairman of the Petrograd Revolutionary Committee, which organized the armed insurrection which gave the Bolsheviks the power. He was made commissar of foreign affairs and conducted the peace negotiations of Brest-Litowsk in 1918. His name was early linked with that of Lenin as being the chief "generals of Bolshevism." He was war commissar from 1918 to 1924, showing remarkable ability in organizing the Russian Red Army. Due to inner party conflicts, he was forced to resign in 1924.

After Lenin's death he broke with the majority of his Party and was finally, in 1928, exiled to a remote frontier village and held a virtual prisoner.

Trotzky is a prolific writer and has written the following books among others: *Dictatorship versus Democracy, The World Situation and Our Problem, Between Imperialism and Revolution, War and Revolution, Literature and Revolution, Problems of Life.*

It is perfectly evident and beyond dispute at the present time that we cannot place our anti-religious propaganda on the level of a straightforward fight against God. That would not be sufficient for us. We supplant mysticism by materialism, broadening above all the collective experience of the masses, heightening their active influence on society, widening the horizon of their positive knowledge, and in this field we deal also, where necessary, direct blows at religious prejudices.

The problem of religion has colossal significance and is most closely bound up with cultural work and with the socialistic structure. Marx in his youth said: "The criticism of religion is the basis of any other criticism." In what sense? In the sense that religion is a kind of fictitious knowledge of the universe. This fiction has two sources: the weakness of man before nature, and the incoherence of social relations. Fearing nature or ignoring it, being unable to analyze the social relations or ignoring them, man in society endeavoured to meet his needs by creating fantastic images, endowing them with imaginary reality and kneeling before his own creations. The basis of this creativeness lies in the practical need of man to orient himself, which, in turn, springs from the conditions of the struggle for existence. Religion is an attempted adaptation to surrounding environment in order successfully to meet the struggle for existence. There are in this adaptation practical and appropriate rules. But all this is bound up with myths, fantasies, superstitions, unreal knowledge. Just as all development of culture is the accumulation of knowledge and skill, so is the criticism of religion the foundation for other criticism. In order to pave the way for correct and real knowledge, it is necessary to remove fictitious knowledge. In this case, however, it

is true only when one considers the question as a whole. Historically, not only in individual cases, but also in the development of whole classes, real knowledge is bound up, in different forms and proportions, with religious prejudices. The struggle against a given religion or against religion in general and against all forms of mythology and superstition is usually successful only when the religious ideology conflicts with the needs of a given class in a new social environment. In other words, when the accumulation of knowledge and the need for knowledge does not fit into the frames of the unreal truths of religion, then one blow with a critical knife sometimes suffices, and the shell of religion drops off.

The success of anti-religious pressure which we have exerted during the last few years is explicable by the fact that the advanced layers of the working class, who went through the school of revolution, that is, the active relation towards the country and social institutions, have easily shaken off from themselves the shell of religious prejudices, which was completely undermined by the preceding developments. But the situation changes considerably when the anti-religious propaganda spreads its influence to the less active layers of the population, not only of the villages, but also of the cities. The real knowledge which has been acquired by them is so limited and fragmentary that it can exist side by side with religious prejudices. Naked criticism of these prejudices, finding no support in personal and collective experience, produces no results. It is, therefore, necessary to make the approach from another angle and to enlarge the sphere of social experience and realistic knowledge. The means towards this end differ. Public dining halls and nurseries may give a revo-

lutionary stimulus to the consciousness of the housewife and may quicken enormously the process of her breaking off from religion. The aviational-chemical methods of destroying the locusts may play the same rôle in regard to the peasant. The very fact that the working man and woman participate in club life, which leads them out of the close little cage of the family flat with its ikon [1] and image lamp, opens one of the ways to freedom from religious prejudices. And so forth and so forth. The club can and must measure the strength of resistance to religious prejudices and find indirect ways to widen experience and knowledge. And so, instead of direct attacks by anti-religious propaganda, we use blockades, barricades, and indirect maneuvers. In general we have just entered such a period, but that does not mean that we will not make a direct attack in the future. It is only necessary to prepare for it.

Is our attack on religion legitimate or illegitimate? It is legitimate. Has it brought any results? It has. Whom has it drawn to us? Those who by previous experience have been prepared to free themselves completely from religious prejudices. And further? There still remain those whom even the great revolutionary experience of October did not shake free from religion. And here the formal methods of anti-religious criticism, satire, caricature, and the like can accomplish very little. And if one presses too strongly one may get an opposite result. One must drill the rock—it is true the rock is not very firm—block it up with dynamite sticks, use indirect attack. After a while there will be a new explosion and a new falling off, that is, another layer of the people will be torn from the larger mass. . . .

[1] A holy picture used in the home and considered to have mystical significance.

The resolution of the eighth meeting of the Party tells us that in this field we must at present pass from the explosion and the attack to a more prolonged work of undermining, first of all, by way of the propaganda of the natural sciences.

To show how a non-prepared frontal attack can sometimes give an entirely unexpected result, I will cite a very interesting example from the experience of the Norwegian Communist Party. As is well known, in 1923 this Party split into an opportunist majority under the direction of Tranmel, and a revolutionary minority faithful to the Communist International. I asked a comrade who lived in Norway how Tranmel succeeded in winning over the majority—of course, only temporarily. He gave me as one of the causes the religious character of the Norwegian workers and fishermen. The fisheries, as you know, have a very low standard of technique and are wholly dependent upon nature. This is the basis for prejudices and superstitions; and religion for the Norwegian fishermen, as wittily expressed by a comrade, is something like a suit of protective clothes. In Scandinavia there were members of the intelligentsia, academicians, who were flirting with religion. They were, quite justly, beaten by the merciless whip of Marxism. The Norwegian opportunists have skilfully taken advantage of this in order to get the fishermen to oppose the Communist International. The fisherman, a revolutionary, deeply sympathetic with the Soviet Republic, favouring with all his soul the Communist International, said to himself: "It comes down to this. Either I must be for the Communist International, but then without God and fish, or willy-nilly, break off." And he did. . . . This illus-

trates the way in which religion cuts into the proletarian policy.

Of course, this applies in a greater degree to our own peasantry whose traditional religious nature is closely knit with the conditions of our backward agriculture. We shall vanquish the deep-rooted religious prejudices of the peasantry only by electrification and chemicalization of peasant agriculture. This of course does not mean that we must not take advantage of each separate technical improvement and of each favourable social moment in general for anti-religious propaganda, for attaining a partial break with the religious consciousness. No, all this is as obligatory as before, but we must have a correct general perspective. By simply closing the churches, as has been done in some places, and by other administrative excesses, you will not only be unable to reach any decisive success but on the contrary you will prepare the way for a stronger return of religion. If it is true that religious criticism is the basis of any other criticism, it is also no less true that in our epoch the electrification of agriculture is the basis for the liquidation of the peasant's superstitions. I shall quote the remarkable words of Engels, until a short time ago unknown, which apply directly to the question of electrification and to the abolition of the abyss between the city and the village. The letter was written by Engels to Bernstein in the year 1883. You remember that in the year 1882 the French engineer, Depré, found a method of transmitting electric energy through a wire. And if I am not mistaken, at an exhibition in Munich he demonstrated the transmission of electrical energy of one of two horsepower for about fifty kilometers. It made a tremendous impression on Engels,

who was extremely sensitive to any inventions in the field of natural science, technique, etc. He wrote to Bernstein: "The newest invention of Depré . . . frees industry from any local limitations, makes possible the use of even the most distant water powers. And even if at the beginning it will be used by the cities only, ultimately it must become the most powerful lever for the abolition of the antagonism between the city and the village."

Vladimir Ilyitch (Lenin) did not know of these lines. This correspondence has appeared only recently, yet he shared this view of the great transformation electricity would make in the peasant psychology.

There are periods of different tempos in the process of abolishing religion, determined by the general conditions of culture. All our clubs must be points for observation. They must always help the party orient itself in this problem, find the moment, take the right tempo.

The complete abolition of religion will be attained only when there is a fully developed socialistic structure, that is, a technique which frees man from any degrading form of dependence upon nature. It can be attained only under social relationships that are free from mystery, that are thoroughly lucid and do not oppress mankind. Religion translates the chaos of nature and the chaos of social relations into the language of fantastic images. Only the abolition of the earthly chaos can end forever its religious reflection. A conscious, reasonable, planned guidance of social life, in all its aspects, will abolish for all time any mysticism and deviltry.

THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN THE STRUGGLE WITH RELIGION

ANATOL VASSILIEVITCH LUNACHARSKY

Anatol Vassilievitch Lunacharsky, People's Commissar for Education of the USSR, was born in Poltava, Russia, where his father was a judge. After finishing the university course at Kiev, he went abroad for further study at Zurich and Paris, and there associated closely with the Russian revolutionists who were forced to live outside their own country. In 1904 he went to Geneva as one of the editors of *Forward,* and from this time on until the outbreak of the war was active in party work, attending conferences, editing papers, and organizing the party school. He worked for a time in Italy and then in Paris, where he edited *The Voice.* During much of this period he was in close contact with Lenin, who entertained a very high opinion of him. His interests were by no means confined to political and economic matters, however, and he wrote on philosophy, religion, and literature, and was himself a poet and dramatist.

He returned to Russia after the February Revolution, and when the Bolsheviks seized power was made People's Commissar for Education. He it was who did most to save the art and architecture of old Russia from the first revolutionary fury of the Communists. When he heard of the damage which had been done to the Church of St. Basil in Moscow, he resigned his office and sent a public letter of protest. In spite of Lenin's persuasions, he refused to reconsider his action, until finally Lenin turned over to him the custodianship of all the art treasures in Russia, including the museums and art galleries. He is to a large extent responsible for the important part education is playing in the new structure of Russia and has welcomed to his aid educational experts from the United States.

THE work of education necessarily includes also the struggle with religious prejudices, beginning with the darkest superstitions and ending with the most refined forms of religious thought and even idealistic philosophy, which, although rejecting any deep and naïve form of the old religion, still endeavors to preserve a little bit of it.

This dark mass in the culture of mankind, which we generally call religious thought, religious feeling, is a very heavy burden upon the shoulders of the laboring classes. It is especially heavy because a considerable part of these laboring classes are under its spell, in its chains; and the corresponding inclination of many so-called educated people toward religious thought tends to reënforce these chains. The most peculiar thing in our struggle with religion consists in the fact that here our enmity is the strongest, the deepest. We do not hate the priest less than we hate the landowner or capitalist, the secret police or some other executioner of the old autocracy. It is an open war. The priest, no matter of what faith, is by his very nature incapable of not hating our Marxism, our Communist Party, our Revolution. Nevertheless, in this point of contact of ours with the old régime, where mutual hatred is burning and where the danger for both parties is very great, we cannot use any direct weapon; we absolutely cannot act with open force.

Passing by the subject of the general harm of religion, one must say that the direct danger, the social-political danger, is very grave. It would be superficial to consider that the so-called Living Church is actually half alive, and that the opposing church groups are entirely dead. No, they represent quite a strong beast with which we shall be obliged to make some kind of a truce. If the Soviet power should waver the least bit, if any kind of possibility should open for counter-revolution, we could say with assurance that the counter-revolution would immediately consolidate with the church, and that the church would pull all the numerous strings at her disposal, which could revive the fanaticism, still far from dead, of our peasants, simple inhab-

itants, women, sometimes even working women, and others.

It is a dangerous enemy, who, feeling at the present that we are stronger, conceals himself, hides his claws, sometimes even endeavors to purr in a friendly manner, disguises himself in rosy colors, pretends to be the "Soviet Clergy," but who in reality is the beast, ready to extend his claws and drive them into our Soviet body at the slightest opportunity. That is why, as it seems, we ought to endeavor as long as we are strong to tear out its claws, extract from the beast its teeth, possibly even destroy it entirely. But the whole trouble is that we cannot attack it by direct force. Our Red Army, our GPU (secret service) are sufficiently strong to arrest all the priests, close the churches and, in case of a turmoil or so-called revolt of believers, to silence and subdue them. But if we adhere to this policy, we would increase the danger of the church, because she would become the persecuted party and would arouse sympathy. The policy of intolerance on our part would drive the disease inside, give it a stronger hold. Hitting the church on the head, we would in reality drive its convictions deeper, like a nail. We must not strike, but uproot them. We need other, incomparably more delicate methods. We must not only abandon hope of using the physical force of the government against the church, but we should also fear to apply this power. We must employ the greatest caution even in indirect forms of attack, as, for example, in snobbish ridicule, in jeering on the part of those in power at those who dare not answer, because such a premature triumph over the church will add to the ardor of the believers, will infuriate them, and will cement them more firmly than before to the priests. Any form of priestly martyrdom

is the worst poison for us! Even when priests acted as counter-revolutionaries, when they wanted to prevent the nationalization of church property to be used to help the famine sufferers, when in this case we had the judicial right on our side, could anybody dare to condemn us for the powerful blows we might have dealt at the church? We have not inflicted those blows, and even in cases where several comrades did so, not without reason, they have been censured. Some comrades said afterwards that in reality the great severity then used has in the final analysis been more harmful than useful, because, I repeat, each step which transforms this big-bellied, drunken, grafter-priest, who is repulsive to the people themselves, who gradually is looked upon as a priest-parasite, any step which transforms him into a firm defender of any Christian teaching, ready with his blood to defend this teaching, results in a direct blow at us. We must see to it that we in no way allow the clergy, whom we justly cite as ridiculous figures, to transform themselves into champions of the faith and martyrs.

If this is the case with the Orthodox (Russian) Church, we in the Department of Education feel it is even more true in regard to the Mohammedan church. She usually was in disfavor during the Czarist régime, if not openly persecuted. If we adopt a policy against the Mahommedan priest and church, the ignorant masses will consider it a persecution of their nationality, as an undue interference of our government in their national affairs, a persecution of all that is for them precious and holy. Remember, too, that to-day the Mohammedan schools in many places are not secular, but belong to the church. If we should abolish these church schools and at the same time could not supply them

with secular schools because of the absence of Mohammedan intellectuals, the result would be that we would uproot the Arabian reading and writing, leaving them in complete darkness and ignorance. The Mohammedan priests harp upon that. They proclaim: "We are for the Soviet Government, we are ready to come to the meetings; in the name of Allah we proclaim that the blessing of Mahomet lies on the Soviet Government. Our Koran says nearly the same thing Lenin did; it is a beneficial teaching for the ignorant masses among whom we work. Also we teach reading and writing in the only possible way. Why do you oppose us? Why don't you give us freedom of action?" With a deep grumble the majority of the population supports these protests, these proclamations of the Mohammedan priests.

And here one must be still more cautious, because one of our commandments is tolerance in regard to faith. We cannot overlook this point in our program. Each man is free to think and believe as he wishes. We may convince people to the contrary, but we cannot prohibit their beliefs. If we should try to do this, in what situation would we be? As for the Orthodox Church we would be leading a policy in direct opposition to that of the Czar, but in regard to the Hebrew, the Mohammedan, and other religions, we would be acting exactly as the Czarist oppressors did. People might say that even though the government is different our faith is just as persecuted as at the time of the Czarist régime! That is why on this question we must exercise the greatest caution. But this makes the problem, possibly, the more alluring.

It is important to uproot religion little by little, instead of driving it deeper with blows. This operation

is an extremely delicate one, but also a very happy and fruitful one, because a well-organized anti-religious propaganda is closely bound up with a general economic improvement, with a decrease of illiteracy among the masses, with acquainting the population with natural sciences, laws, and the social sciences, thus enlightening them in regard to what is going on in the world. One of the strongest weapons we may use against religion is to explain the origin of religion, its development, its rôle in general up to now and at the present time.

In a word, this propaganda, taken from the point of view of the struggle with this most terrible enemy, an imaginary God and his not at all imaginary followers, is extremely broad. It demands from the active atheist, from the active fighter, who participates in this struggle, a broad education, good preparation in natural science and history, knowledge of the habits and customs of the people with whom he is dealing, insight into their psychology to avoid hurting their feelings, insulting them, repulsing them, and to undermine gradually some detrimental old beliefs. All these are problems requiring great mental efforts.

It goes without saying that a great weapon against religion is art. The church itself was always armed with art; it exhibited magnificent architecture, introduced solemn chanting, beautiful ceremonies; it availed itself of painting, sculpture—in a word all the arts were serving the church. The church knew very well how to allure the hearts of men. It has done all this for its own glorification. We now in our turn must arm ourselves with all the powers of art. Panoplying it with the piercing arrows of artistic humor, we marshal it against the church. The further we proceed, the more no doubt will we have to avail ourselves of art as a

weapon against the fascination for some Christians of the "serene Christ's Resurrection," with all its traditional adornments and its ecclesiastical embellishments which attract even those people who ordinarily would not think of religion, but who in this case are drawn to its esthetics by the memories of childhood—a sort of church honey. But it is essential that these festivities should be well planned, should be attractive, and should create new and striking pages of habits and customs, should institute just as alluring forms of social contact among us under the red banner, under the Sun of Rising Life, dear to our hearts, as those of the church, which knew how to transform its own festivities. For our little Octobrists and Pioneers such festivities would then be transformed into thoroughly reasonable habits for collective celebration. You see what a colossal and highly important problem it is! All this is now only in its beginning, in embryo, because we still must study a great deal, because we are as yet poorly equipped. But if we bear in mind that each step in this study makes us armed fighters against the most oppressing darkness which weighs upon our brethren, then of course we will with the greatest joy, the greatest readiness, start preparing, because it promises us the tremendous reward of victory over the monster, which religion in our eyes justly appears to be.

From this point of view I consider that there can be no work of the Department of Education, beginning with the first reader and ending with college or university, which is not atheistic and actively godless. There is no possibility of any work in anti-religious education or any other education which would agree with the previous old views of education, in general.

Comrade Lenin has so often picturesquely empha-

sized that as soon as we shall rid ourselves of our enemies and insure our physical existence, we must immediately occupy ourselves with civilization, raising the cultural level of our masses in the direction of a sane science and rational forms of brotherly social life. At the present moment we dare to say and must state that there is no other work so important as that phase of the educational system in which positive knowledge is obtained, in which the people get technical preparation for their further growth, making life more sound and sane and establishing for the first time conditions for cultural hygiene. The church is a pestilence. It is a germ which poisons our life. It diverts a great amount of energy from real problems by all kinds of nonsense about the other world and about the fate of the soul after death.

We must struggle against it, but not as the brave Caucasian tribe does with raids and the destruction of the church. Our work must consist in a basic conscientious task, performed with unusual intensity, first in arming ourselves and then in giving a broad education to the masses. This is the motto we must put before us. And if, as I have previously stated, each first reader must begin not only with the words "we are not slaves," but also open with words of anti-religious propaganda, if we must give to each small child an antidote to what is told him in his family, on the other hand our work can and must rest only on the wide basis of general natural scientific and social education. Only armed with this knowledge can the atheist lead his struggle with the church effectively and successfully.

THE NECESSITY FOR ANTI-RELIGIOUS PROPAGANDA

EMELIYAN YAROSLAVSKY

Yaroslavsky was born in 1878 and undertook journalism as a profession. In 1903 he became a member of the Social Democratic Party and its organizer in the Transbaikal District. Eight years of his life have been spent in prison galleys and four years in exile in Siberia. In 1917 he became a member of the District Committee of Yakutsk and in 1918 was editing *Rural Truth*. In 1919 he was made a delegate to the All Russian Central Executive Committee from the provinces of Kazan and Saratov, being at the same time editor of the Perm *Star* and *Red Ural*. From 1919 to 1922 he was member of the Soviet of Omsk, secretary of the Siberian Bureau of the Central Committee, and editor of *Soviet Siberia*. He has also been one of the leading organizers of the Atheist Society in Russia. This organization maintains several anti-religious periodicals and has distributed millions of pamphlets and cartoons against religion among the peasants and city workers.

At present he is secretary of the Central Control Commission, a member of its board, and a strong supporter of Stalin.

ANTI-RELIGIOUS propaganda is essential for a revolutionary working class and peasantry because the religious view of the world is false. It is diametrically opposed to the cultural development of humanity in the sciences. It is also a pernicious faith for the proletariat and the peasantry. In the entire history of humanity—since classes first began—the religious concept, changing in accordance with social and economic changes, has always acted as a sort of political agitator who, sitting on the head of an oppressed man, induced him by all sorts of threats of punishment from God or by promises of reward from God to submit without murmuring, even with joy, to a hard fate. Therefore the religious world

conception played its part in the stability and durability of the Tsar's autocracy.

This religious concept has been used by every oppressing ruling class, sometimes willingly and sometimes unwillingly, for the consolidation of its dominion. This was done with the help of the priesthood and other religious preachers. The priesthood was a part of the ruling economic and political groups of landlords, money-lenders, slave-holders, merchants, factory-owners, speculators, bankers, and so forth. It also was itself a land-owner, money-lender, and so on, while at the same time it was the apparatus of agitation for the whole ruling group. It aimed to consolidate ideologically all classes of society in one solid and firm apparatus, which would "manufacture" revenues for the ruling classes.

To-day the church is a willing or unwilling "social conciliator," agitating for the reconciliation of the oppressed masses with their oppressors, and thus postponing the advent of a proletarian revolution. Moreover, through this "conciliation," all these agitators of the bourgeoisie are striving to frighten the oppressed masses. Fascism, which is now a terroristic variation of social conciliation—a sort of reverse side to it—is using for its own purposes, as are all other "social conciliators," the religiousness of the masses, religious symbols, religious propaganda and agitation.

The most powerful form of "social conciliation" undoubtedly is the religious ideology. Its extraordinary tenacity of life is due to the fact that it is deeply entrenched in the backward toiling masses. Sometimes even a revolutionary movement of the masses has taken the form of a religious movement, as for instance the peasant wars in Germany and the sectarians and dis-

senters in the Tsarist epoch. This was due to the backwardness of the class consciousness of the masses, or to their blind despair. In any case the religious form of the movement could not but harm it, and was never advantageous.

Therefore all revolutionary workers ought to struggle not only with those who propagate religious teachings, but with the very foundations of religious conceptions as well. Only the Communist parties of the Third International are to-day making a decisive struggle with these conceptions. According to the social democrats, religion "is a private affair." Such a fallacious idea was brilliantly refuted by Comrade Lenin. In his article entitled "Socialism and Religion," Lenin wrote in the year 1905 that as far as the party and the socialistic development of the proletariat was concerned, religion could not be considered a private affair. "Our party is a conscientious union of sincere fighters for the liberation of the working class. Such a union cannot remain indifferent to the superstitious darkness and demoniacal frenzies of religious beliefs.

We demand a full separation of church and state in order to struggle with religious obscurity and mist. We have founded our Union for the purpose of struggling against every religious nonsense of the workers. For us the ideological struggle is not a private affair, but a common-party business, as well as a common proletariat business."

The All Union Communist Party in the thirteenth article of its program demands of all its members an active anti-religious propaganda. The Communist Party does not limit itself to a separation of church and state. The Communist Party believes in a planned and conscious social economic activity of all the masses, and

this demands a complete extinction of all religious prejudices. The Party is striving to break the bonds between the exploiting classes and religious propaganda. It is aiding in the liberation of the toiling masses from all kinds of religious prejudices; and for that purpose it organizes a widespread scientific anti-religious propaganda. In carrying out this propaganda we try not to offend religious feelings. This would only provoke a consolidation of religious fanaticism.

The All Union Communist Party is the vanguard of the proletariat and leads the workers and peasantry by means of Socialism toward the final victory over the international bourgeoisie. It must of necessity spread anti-religious propaganda, using the methods and principles of Comrade Lenin. He said in 1909: "In the struggle against religion, one must explain to the masses from the materialistic point of view the derivation of their creeds and religion." "One cannot limit the struggle against religion to mere abstract ideological talks; the struggle must be in close connection with the concrete practices of the class movement." "The Marxist must be . . . a materialist and a dialectic, i.e. he must lead the whole struggle against religion not in the abstract, but in a very concrete manner; he must place it on the ground of the class struggle, the necessity of educating the masses better." Therefore our anti-religious propaganda must be correlated with the entire activity of the Soviet power, as well as with the problems which it faces. The most urgent problems of the socialistic structure are the question of the peasantry, i.e. harmony between city and village, the increase of labor efficiency in agriculture, securing the support of the poor peasants, helping them to throw away the bonds of the rich peasant both economical and spiritual.

This is being done through coöperation, electrification, tractors, and all the works of the soviets. The chief difficulty with which anti-religious propaganda meets is the deep roots of the peasant's religious consciousness. This is how there can be a practical coöperation between the soviet government and the anti-religious propaganda. The soviet by improving the agricultural technique, introducing a planned organization into the economic and social life, as well as by liberating the peasant from the rich owner, is cutting the two roots of the peasant's religious consciousness: his dependence on the elements of nature and on the social classes. On the other hand, anti-religious propaganda helps the soviet by clearing up and organizing the conscience of the whole mass of peasantry, and by setting aside the pernicious backwardness of the peasant mind and its social conciliating tendencies. Since the peasant is still a "small proprietor," and also a backward conservative, our principal aim should be to improve the whole rural economy —anti-religious propaganda in the villages must have an "economic approach"—through coöperation, through the propaganda of electrification, through committees of mutual assistance, and so forth. One must however treat economic questions not in isolation but in connection with social questions, questions concerning the problems and activities of the soviet power, concerning the exploitation of the rich kulaks, et cetera. It is not difficult to pass from economic questions to social questions. The question, "Is religion useful for the peasant economy?" may be easily bound with that of "Is religion useful in general for the whole life of the middle-class peasant, and of the poor peasant?" To those two questions may be easily related the further question, "Is the soviet power useful to these classes?"

We must center attention on the facts of nature and society. We must take the veil off the sanctity of the priests and all the biblical absurdities—their explanation of holy days, ceremonies, beliefs, customs—and we must make clear the class meaning of every religion.

In fighting religion one does not have to give up using the bourgeois or even "divine" literature. In both can be found a great deal of useful material for our anti-religious work. The center of the anti-religious propaganda should be the village reading rooms. We should draw into the work all the cultural forces of the villages, teachers, agricultural experts, coöperators, engineers, and so forth. So far the party has been helped in anti-religious work by a non-party organization, The Union of Atheists of the USSR. Its propaganda has been of various forms, including lectures, talks in clubs, theatrical performances, plays, moving pictures, exhibitions, posters, anti-religious corners, educational literature, belletristics, newspapers, experience meetings, readings, excursions, and individual work.

RELIGION A PRIVATE MATTER

ARTHUR CRISPIEN

Arthur Crispien, President of the German Social Democratic Party, was born in Konigsberg, the city of Immanuel Kant, in 1875. His father, a painter, was frequently out of work and the children were often hungry. At fourteen the boy went to work and became a painter's apprentice, then a tapestry decorator, a trade which he tells us he thoroughly enjoyed. He was already an ardent young Socialist and before he was in his teens had carried banners in Socialist demonstrations. In 1893, when he was eighteen, he was made secretary of the newly formed Social Democratic organization in Konigsberg.

Party work gradually absorbed all his time, and he became a paid organizer, and later editor of the Socialist paper in Stuttgart.

During the war he opposed the majority of the Social Democrats who supported the government, and he was forbidden to speak. In spite of this he conducted several peace demonstrations, and was finally thrown into prison. Released from there, he was sent into the trenches and served fourteen months on the French front, where he kept his vow never to turn his gun against anyone.

After the Armistice he helped to depose the king of Wurtemberg and to found a republic of which he was made minister of the interior. As president of the Independent Socialist Party he went as a delegate to Moscow, but refused to join with the Communists, and in 1922 the independent group rejoined the majority.

Since 1920 he has been a member of the Reichstag, where he has labored continuously to promote better relations between Germany and France. At the great Socialist demonstration in Paris in memory of Jaures he spoke for the German Social Democrats.

Mr. Crispien is the author of several books and pamphlets, one of which, *Notes of a Countryless Comrade,* has enjoyed considerable popularity.

THE German Social Democratic Party in its program aims at "the evolution of capitalistic production to a state of social ownership. This change from capitalistic production to socialistic will ensure the utilization of the forces of production for the highest welfare of the people. Society will then for the first time emerge from

its present all-pervading chaos and the domination of blind economic forces into a state of free and harmonious solidarity."

This implies that Social Democracy has an earthly task and purpose: by the socializing of the capitalistic means of production men are to be freed from the operation of blind economic forces; and Social Democracy will found on earth a society devoted to the greatest good.

In accordance with their program, the by-laws of the Social Democratic Party, which govern questions of membership, contain no expression upon religious matters. Anyone therefore who is in agreement with the political and economic methods and aims of Social Democracy can become a member of the party. No one asks the question, What is your attitude toward religion? Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Dissenters, and Atheists all belong to the party. Everyone settles the question of religion according to his own liking. Religion is for the Social Democrat a private matter.

Social Democracy should seek in its socialistic society the fulfillment of democracy in all its fields. This includes the right to freedom of speech. Democracy can be attained only through long and persistent struggle against the opposing forces. Social Democracy is a movement by the overwhelming majority of society in the interests of the masses. This majority cannot be moved by force, but only by training and enlightenment.

"The Social Democrat fights, not for new class privileges and rights, but for the abolition of class domination and class itself, for equal rights and duties for all, without distinction of birth or sex. He fights not only against the exploitation and oppression of the wage-

earner, but against every form of exploitation and oppression, whether it be against a people, a party, a class or a race."

Social Democracy stands pledged to the same freedom of expression which it demands for itself, for every movement, including religion and the church. All such organizations should be entitled to make their own rules, and to agitate and organize freely. Thus, in the November Revolution of 1918, Social Democracy removed the legal restrictions which had hampered the Catholic church in its free and full development.

The state is a purely secular institution. To it belong men of all religions and of no religion. It should not become the instrument of any church, for the interests of such lie in unworldly matters, and heavenly things should never be confused with and misused for worldly purposes.

Social Democracy therefore declares in its program: That the public organization of education, schooling, culture, and research should be secular; that any public influence of church or religion on these matters ought to be restricted; that the church should be separated from the state and from the school, whether grammar school, vocational school, or college. No public means are to be used for church and religious purposes.

The clear position of Social Democracy on the question of religion has been given through the research of Friederich Engels, after Marx, the chief founder of economic socialism. "Religion is nothing but a fantastic reflection in the minds of men, of those outward forces which rule their daily lives, a reflection in which natural forces take on a supernatural character."

And Karl Marx in *Kapital* says: "Christianity with its belief in the abstract man is the correspondingly

religious form to commercial society, especially in its bourgeois development of Protestantism, Deism, etc. The religious reflection in the material world can only disappear when the conditions of the practical everyday life of man are seen in their relation to each other and to nature."

We know that capitalistic economics have had results which are wholly evil: fluctuations of price, crises, and unemployment. He who wishes to discover the fundamental causes of such phenomena, who earnestly wishes to better them, must become a student of national economy. The masses are not. They are dominated by blind economic forces to them inexplicable, which operate ruthlessly against mankind, and which in their conception assume a supernatural character. Let us make clear to these masses that their economic and political life is determined by human activities. Then all mystical delusion will disappear from the work-a-day life of man. They will then understand that the work of man can be altered only by man. They will realize that the socialistic state, systematically and beneficially planned, is the ideal state of society. Economic forces will be controlled by men of wisdom and vision, and men will become lords of their own destiny here on earth.

In contradistinction to the bourgeois conception of historical laws, Social Democracy is of the opinion that there are no immutable laws determining the fate of mankind. Social Democracy is convinced that ideology is determined by the evolution of social and economic factors, that these have only relative value and are in a state of constant flux. It therefore shuns any injection of questions of religion into the proletarian class struggle. Its aim is not to explain society, but to alter it.

Men should not look upon this earth as a vale of tears and fly from rude realities to a world of phantasms; they should embrace the beauties of the world, and realize and fulfill their social rights and duties.

Our work lies with this world. As to the other, each is at liberty to decide according to his own needs.

RELIGIOUS NEUTRALITY

BERNHARD GOERING

Bernhard Goering was born in Berlin in 1897, the son of a factory watchman. He spent his childhood and youth in the proletarian section of the metropolis. After only a common school education economic necessity forced him to go to work at the age of 14. In one of the large department stores, he first came to clearly understand the difference between the propertied and the propertyless classes. Finding no moral satisfaction in his work, he felt an urge to seek activities outside. An opportunity offered itself in the Young People's Movement, which about the year 1912 began to show a rapid growth in Germany. At that time the youth of Germany had to decide between the usual patriotic clubs, the school clubs, the proletarian young people's movement and the young people's Christian associations. Guenther Dehn, with whom he later became associated, tried to create a young people's movement, which would be neither along the lines of the patriotic societies, nor of the young people's Christian associations, and which would differ from the proletarian movement in that it was not tied up definitely to any one party program. Becoming more and more conscious of class differences through the experiences of his daily work, his community activity, as expressed in the young people's movement, became more and more valuable to him. At the same time he continued his studies after business hours and finally qualified for a diploma. The war hypnotised him for a very few months, only while he and his friends were under the impression that it was brought on by a hostile invasion, that it was a war of defense. The premature death of some of his friends, who were killed in the war, discussions about the nonsense of any kind of war and close relationship to those who shared this opinion finally led him to adopt conditional pacifism and socialism. In 1916 he joined the Free Union Movement of Employees, in 1918 he became a member of the Social Democratic Party. The outbreak of the revolution found him as the chairman of the employees of a German munition plant. In the turmoil of the years of the revolution he led discussions on the relationship of the people's welfare to the economic order. As a result of this he became co-founder of the Federation of Religious Socialists, simultaneously being very active in the trade union in the capacity of an honorary officer. In 1921 he was made executive officer in the chief committee of the Central Union of Employees. In 1922 he was delegated to the organization of Free Employees' Unions, the AFA federation, as Secretary, where he is still active

today. This is a general federation of salaried employees with a membership of 258,000 including foremen, technical employees and officials. It is not affiliated with the General German Trade Unions of manual workers, but there is, in fact, some cooperation and understanding between them.

THE free-trade-union movement of workers and employees of Germany, in setting forth its fundamental principles, lays particular stress on religious neutrality, feeling that the attitude and relationship of the individual to religious and philosophical questions are matters of the conscience of each individual. For external reasons alone the movement is forced to enter upon a path of neutrality, since the various organizations of the union comprise men and women of the widest differences in religion and in world outlook. There are freethinkers, free religionists, catholics, protestants, Jews, et cetera. Any tendency to pin the movement down to a definite program—in either direction—is liable to impair the inner unity of the masses, who must form close ranks for the special tasks put before them.

The free-trade unions are fighting for an improvement in their economic and social conditions and to protect their rights against capitalism. We fight for an increase in the share of production profits, for better working conditions and protection against worse, for the legal protection of the working man against the injurious effect of capitalistically hired labor. We demand a complete recognition of the rights of the working man before that of dead ownership, the abolition of effortless private revenues, the control of the production and distribution of goods, a coöperative system of economic management, the right of the worker to participate in all decisions pertaining to wages and working conditions. We perceive in this socialistic program a higher form of economic organization than that con-

trolled by private capital. Our union work supplements the activities of the political parties in the various fields, especially the cultural.

Our emphasis on religious neutrality has always been embodied in our party platforms. However, owing to long-standing political and union arguments, our unions have been—and still are—compelled to parry the attacks of their adversaries by bringing evidence to the effect that the religious views of the individual can harmonize with his affiliation with the socialist party and the free trade unions. This is not only proved by the scientific writing of leading theologists, such as the Catholic chaplain Hohoff and his pupil, Dr. Steinbuechel, the Swiss ministers Raggatz and Kutter, but by the organization of Religious Socialists in Germany.

I have for many years been a member of the socialist party and also in the service of the free-employee-union movement. Never during all these years has a conflict occurred between my religious views and the practical work in party and union. The founder of Christianity always took the part of the oppressed, for which we have evidence not only in his spoken word but in his entire conduct as well. He advocated a community of men with no discrimination as to birth or social standing. Not the possessions and prerogatives of the single individual, but the welfare of all, he pointed out as the ideal goal. That is why I am of the opinion that the workers' struggle and fight against the ruling upper classes are well in keeping with the teachings of Christian ethics. The figure of Christ, in my judgment, is of one who, by his own life and experience, wanted to show the road to a new and better world for mankind here on this earth.

It cannot be denied that religious tendencies adapt

themselves to a large extent to material conditions and the whole intellectual structure of society. Religious-philosophical forms correspond to the respective cultural level of mankind. Not the form, but the inner life—that is, the intrinsic attitude of the individual toward the whole universe—is the deciding factor with me. I believe there is a divine purpose for all. The will of the Creator is carried out into the universe. That which in all our doings causes us to halt, to look into our inmost selves, to think over our actions and weigh them; this inner voice which tells every human being whether he has done right or wrong, good or harm—that is part of the power which I call divine.

Thus, out of an innermost conviction, I uphold my right to be in the ranks of my working brethren, fighting for a better world. It is Freedom, Equality, and Brotherhood for which the proletarians, and those who join them, are struggling. This fight is a holy fight—it is in conformity with the principles of Christ.

AT THE THRESHOLD OF A NEW RELIGIOUS EPOCH

KARL MENNICKE

Karl Mennicke was born in 1887 in Elberfeld on the Rhine. Due to the severe illness of his father, which lasted for thirty years, he was sent to work at the earliest possible age permitted by law. In spite of this handicap, the boy managed to continue his studies and finally graduated from the Theological Seminary in 1914. He took a position as vicar near Godesberg on the Rhine. The World War shocked his entire moral fiber. He felt that it was hard to reconcile poison gas, machine guns, and liquid fire with the spirit of Christ. Drafted in January, 1915, he applied for a place in the sanitary service. After reaching the front he wrote a pacifist article for the *International Review*. It was seized by the censor and sent back to division headquarters. As a punishment Mennicke was transferred to the infantry. In the trenches he soon became interested in the social problems of the proletarian soldiers, most of whom had been factory workers. Feeling strongly the injustice of the status of the average laborer, he became convinced that they needed to organize for their rights. He joined the Social Democratic Party. In the fall of 1920 he was appointed lecturer at the German Institute of Politics and in 1923 became director of the social political Seminar. He has been a prominent speaker for the trade unions of Germany and is in constant demand. He is also editor of the *Journal on Religious Socialism*.

THE author of this chapter has come out of a church background; I have studied theology and was a minister for one year in a Ruhr mining colony.

At the outbreak of the War my relationship to the church received its first decisive blow. The church not only affirmed war as necessary, but even repeatedly welcomed and glorified it. Theologists of repute called the Fourth of August the greatest day of their lives. To me all this was utterly incomprehensible in view of the fact that Christ himself forbade his disciples to op-

pose evil and called the peacemakers blessed. At the same time it became evident to me (I clearly expressed my views at a meeting during the first weeks of the War) that a Christian attitude could not be expected of the nations, since Christians were in a hopeless minority. But the Church of Christ must take such an attitude, if it is not to disgrace Christ's name. The actual attitude of the church, however, was, I felt, really a blasphemy of the name of Christ. Therefore, inwardly I began to grow away from it.

This inner opposition to the church became more outspoken through the experience gained in the War, where I served for two years as a sanitary worker with an infantry company. The first thing I came to realize was that the attitude of the church (including the field chaplain) was in absolute contradiction to the genuine religious feelings of my comrades and, consequently, it was out of the question for the broad masses of the army to have confidence in the church. I became absolutely convinced during these weeks at the front that the German soldier desired peace, nay, even loved peace. The church, however, shared the sentiments and feelings of the capitalistic and militaristic circles which wanted war and glorified it. I have seen comrades clenching their fists even with tears of anger in their eyes after such religious field services.

Slowly there dawned on my consciousness a still more revolutionary realization when I saw that as far as human relationship and human betterment was concerned, the Christian church was utterly powerless. Up to that time I had had only a very hazy idea about the actual conditions of modern industrial labor. Through conversations with my comrades, many of whom told me the story of their lives (with that amazing accuracy of

memory for personal experience which marks the proletarian) I gained a clear insight. Two things became evident to me: first, that people who are entirely absorbed in the struggle for their daily sustenance in the long run are bound to lose interest in spiritual and intellectual things (they can neither gain nor preserve such an interest); second, that the "white-collared" groups who because of their social and financial standing can cultivate an intellectual and spiritual life, have almost no interest, let alone any real thoroughgoing understanding of the distressing conditions under which labor is toiling. This latter revelation was the one which affected me most, since in a certain sense it concerned me personally. While still in college, I had tried to gain an understanding of human relations and social questions. But the religious leaders and theological schools could not give me the slightest idea of the real situation. On the contrary, they tried to awaken in me an aversion for social-democratic godlessness and for socialist materialism.

At last I came to know social democrats face to face. I realized more and more deeply that society in its blindness and lack of understanding has played false in an unheard of manner to a whole stratum of humanity, and also that the Christian church, the supposed bearer and witness of the Christian spirit, far from trying to bring society to its senses, had helped to increase its blindness and obduracy. Such experiences led me to the socialistic movement and brought me into the ranks of the social democratic party. In the course of the decade which has now elapsed since the end of the war, these convictions have grown infinitely richer and deeper, and have finally caused me to part company with the church.

As I see things to-day, the claim of the church to be the representative of the spirit of Christ in this world is, in the light of world history, a ridiculous mockery. The alliance of the Church with the upper and middle classes, with their sentiments and ideas, is with very few exceptions so complete that there is hardly a trace left of the radicalism of the religious spirit of Christ. During these years I have learned much about the weaknesses and deficiencies of the socialistic movement and I am very far from asserting that my companions are generally better than the members of the Christian church (although I cannot help admitting that courageous living and willingness to self-sacrifice is found much more frequently in the ranks of the socialistic proletariat, than in the majority of Christian circles); at least the socialistic movement does not disguise itself behind a religious spirituality which has hardly any relationship at all to actual life. Socialism is therefore open and honest on all social problems.

It has taken these problems seriously and has made a genuine effort to improve conditions, whereas church circles, driven into a corner by the course of historical developments, have only just begun to take them seriously.

The conclusion I have reached in these years approaches very closely to that of Karl Marx's materialistic conception of history. Man, both individually and as a group, is determined in conduct and manner of life by economic interests. To-day in a capitalistic world intellectual forces play a minor part and the Christian spirit particularly is condemned to complete impotence. In its theological and philosophical expression the less it is willing to admit the domination of economic interests, the more certain it is that it is subject to them.

This entire criticism applies, of course, to the "Christian" churches only as social organisms. The spirit of Christ himself stands far above them. It is far more a sign of the truth that another attitude to life than that generally adopted is possible. In other words, that it is basically possible to derive one's life from one's convictions and to assert a faith in the power and the essence of the spirit against all temptations and obstacles. Love in the spirit of Christ means that I should under no circumstances let myself be tempted to treat my fellow creatures differently than I would treat my own brother. I should rather take upon myself pain and hardships than that his confidence in my brotherly attitude should be shaken. And the most convincing feature of this unique phenomenon of history is that such conduct was not only taught and preached, but also incontrovertibly demonstrated by a life of infinite hardships. All the wretched earthly standards of the churches cannot alter an iota of this inner power and greatness of Christ.

According to my experience, it is incontrovertible that the socialistic laboring masses have clearly distinguished between the figure of Christ and the actual figure of the Christian churches. One usually finds at large proletarian mass meetings that a sincere expression of devotion to the great Nazarene receives an appreciative hearing. Still it would be wrong to assume that because of this labor has any close or even warm relationship to Jesus. On the contrary, to the laboring masses the figure of Christ seems far away, almost alien. The reasons for this are perfectly clear.

For modern labor the feeling that human life is first of all a matter of eternal life, and only secondarily a matter of this world, has been entirely lost. The high-strung eschatologic mood, or expectation of Jesus, has

no sounding-board in the masses of the proletariat of to-day. The supreme problem of man and human society is felt to be a matter of this world only. All energy must be directed toward the improvement and reshaping of worldly conditions. Consequently, one approves of all the means which can serve this purpose: strikes, economic and political struggles of any kind, and finally, if necessary, even the use of force. To the modern industrial worker it seems utterly impossible to follow the motto of Christ—service, sacrifice, and finally the way of the cross. This motto is only comprehensible when faith in a future life has not been shattered. The minute one's faith in this begins to waver, or is lost, there is no longer any sense in sacrificing in the interest of a moral perfection or eternal bliss, which is only fiction anyhow. All intellectual and spiritual interests are then necessarily dominated by the reconstruction of this world. Even if one could say that the forces of suffering and enduring love, which have been glorified in the teachings and life of Jesus, would bring about a change for the better in human society, this nevertheless is an idea that is infinitely alien to the psychology of the workers in their present status. And again this is due primarily to the obscuration and corruption which the spirit of Christ has experienced through the practice of the Christian church.

So much for the attitude of labor toward the church. What about the fate of religion in the general sense of the word within the present-day labor movement? It is not easy to penetrate into the core of this question. However, a brief attempt can be made.

Questions about the ultimate responsibility of human life are liable to take a secondary place, or partially to disappear entirely from the social consciousness, if

material conditions become intolerable, or despotic, so that many members of human society are excluded from responsible participation in the organized forms of social life. Such was the case on the farms near the end of the middle ages. At that time the conditions led to peasant wars. On a much wider scale the same is true to-day of the capitalistic economic system. Therefore, the class struggle is inevitable. As shown by late developments in Germany, this is in the last analysis carried on solely for the right of the worker to enter into a responsible participation in political, social, and economical affairs. It is only natural that where oppression and exploitation are prevalent to a high degree, faith in the deeper meaning of life must disappear. On the other hand, it is inevitable that this question should emerge again inasmuch as when a class group does participate in the concrete formation and solution of problems in the field of economics, society, and state, it will soon find that these problems cannot be solved without the deeper forces of human nature coming into play. Imperatively this requires an analysis of the reality of human nature, its basis in an ethical conscience, and with this, the infinity and eternity of all things. And that means nothing else but that the religious problem is again brought into the consciousness of society.

It is my conviction that herein lies the great hope for the future. I am a socialist, because in my opinion only here lies hope. For the socialistic social order signifies nothing else than the unceasing effort to have all members of society participate in the responsible formation of the social life. It is also quite evident that religion and the religious consciousness would then acquire a new significance as against Christianity. The Christian

epoch in history is obviously on its way to extinction. The eschatological mood of Christianity has been a handicap, and still is, for the Christian community has difficulty finding an organic relationship to the creative problems of social life. As long as social standards were thought to have been fully made and completed, this could be hidden. To-day, however, the natural heritage of occidental society has almost been used up and it is peremptorily forced to the task of arranging the world in such a way that men living in it can feel that life has a meaning. Striving after the comprehension of the deeper meaning of life must be united in an entirely new way with the reshaping of social conditions, and this means nothing else than that we are standing at the threshold of a new religious epoch.

For us socialists, who have such an idea, it is not going to be an easy road within the German socialistic movement. The general distrust the workers show toward the Christian churches has largely brought about a distrust for any kind of religious consciousness. Even where leaders express themselves in this newer way they seldom find a receptive hearing. But the intelligent individual will understand the situation and know how to bear his fate. There is no other way to awaken our present-day society to a religious consciousness except through such sacrifice. This experience may in part be a very bitter one and almost unbearable at times. Every failure of one's strength, every failure of our hopes is a bitter experience in the life of the individual; what shall be said of such failures in social life, where the consequences are usually more bitter and inexorable? But if society is not to despair, it must start anew forever—at first it will do it perhaps only reluctantly—learn from experience, which always means, to go

deeper into one's consciousness. That this is already a credo, I am fully conscious. I have tried to give with it a timorous expression to the new religious consciousness.

LABOR AND THE CHURCH IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

EMANUEL RADL

Emanuel Radl is perhaps more a typical representative of the intellectual class than he is of the organized labor group. His contribution is included in this volume because he was selected personally by President Masaryk as the one who could best portray the attitude of labor on religion in Czechoslovakia. He was born in 1873 and is now professor of biology at the University of Prague and a leader of the Social Democrats.

E. Radl is president of the Y. M. C. A. in Czechoslovakia and president of the Philosophical Society in Prague. He believes that Marxism is the only basis of practical Socialism but that it must be thoroughly reshaped, the Marxistic materialism being unacceptable. He is the author of a great many scientific books as well as a history of *The War Between the Czechs and Germans*. He believes that antagonisms between nations can be overcome by rational, planned cooperative effort.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA is an agricultural and industrial country. Its population of about thirteen and one-half millions is made up of about forty percent agricultural and thirty-four percent industrial workers. Since a large percentage of the agriculturalists are also working people—though mostly not organized as such—labor is statistically the strongest element in the country.

Labor is organized here into many political parties, and these are looked upon as the true leaders of the labor movement. Anglo-Saxon readers should note the fact that political organizations have had in our country a far greater importance for intellectual life than in England or the United States, and each has, or at least has had, or pretended to have, its own philosophy. The

parties claim to be really "movements," each with its own view of the world, *Weltanschauung*. Labor organizations have especially tried to hold their members together in a world of their own and not to allow them to mix with the bourgeois, so that athletics and popular lectures about science and literature and all such activities have been organized on political lines.

The socialistic parties are the political representatives of the labor movement.

	Voters
Communists (organized 1920)	933,000
Social democrats	630,000
Czechoslovak socialists (organized in 1897)	609,000
German social democrats	363,000
German Christian socialists	289,000
German national socialists	140,000
Magyar Christian socialists	85,000

The Christian socialists are practically Roman Catholics, sometimes antisemitic; they are not looked upon as truly representative of labor ideals. Also the communists, social democrats and the Czechoslovak socialists play a rôle in the relationship of labor to the church.

The chief churches of the country are:

Roman Catholics	10,000,000
Greek Catholics	500,000
Orthodox	80,000
Protestants	1,000,000
Czechoslovak church	500,000
Jews	181,000
Non-confessional	700,000

In general the churches play a far lesser part in our public life than in the United States. People are accustomed to speak of the churches as exploded institu-

tions that are factors only among the uneducated classes. Under the Austrian government the Roman Catholic church had the special protection of the political authority and was therefore favorable to the monarchy, the aristocracy, and the army. It owned, and owns still, great landed properties and is by its theory as well as by its property policy committed to support the case of capitalism. The non-Catholic churches are poor. Since the war Roman Catholics are in general democratic, indeed nationalistic. Politically their influence is strong enough, religiously they are not so vigorous. A large proportion of Roman Catholics are organized in political parties of their own, looked upon as conservative; the public generally identifies Roman Catholicism with these political parties. Therefore criticism of the Roman church and its doctrines means frequently simply a criticism of a political party, especially when it takes a position contrary to spiritual ideals. The modern Roman Catholic tendency toward a separation of church and politics is not much in evidence in our country. After the war, a new church, the so-called Czechoslovak church, was founded by those who had left Roman Catholicism; its creed is not yet entirely settled. The Protestants are numerically and politically weak, but have an important intellectual influence. We have many outside all churches, mostly from those who left Roman Catholicism. The Protestant Czechoslovaks and non-confessionals are generally looked upon as "progressives" and anti-Catholics.

Under these conditions the relation of labor to the church means practically the relation of socialism to Roman Catholicism.

The philosophy of our labor movement has been very strongly under the influence of Marxism. The social

democrats and the communists both started as Marxist movements; the Czechoslovak socialists refused programmatically to acknowledge Marx, but not having produced a philosophy of their own, they have been under the influence of their Marxist brethren, from whom a strong nationalist feeling has divided them.

As Marxists the communists are in theory opposed to religion the same as the Russian leaders of communism. In practice, this opposition to religion as a poison of humanity has not had any considerable effect upon our public thought, nor does it greatly influence their membership. Many communists have no interest in religion, but this is by no means characteristic of communism or socialism alone; many communist voters are members of the church, and the party leaders have to reckon with this fact, because too much anti-religious propaganda would drive members out of their party. Thus atheism may be said to be only a watchword for the intellectual leaders, and among them there is no fresh intellectual vigor in the matter. They only repeat old formulae.

The social democrats are in a complicated situation. As Marxists before the war, they were educated in atheism and led to fight Christianity as a reactionary support of capitalism. The proletariat should be delivered from Christian superstition; only the defeat of Christian teaching would set the proletariat free for the organization of a new, socialistic state. In public life the social democrats were looked upon as the very counterpole to the church. By "the church" Roman Catholicism only was in mind. The church made no attempt to approach the working class in a friendly way. The Vatican officially condemned the Marxist economic theories; the hierarchy supported the policy of the rul-

ing classes; the doctrines of the church were looked upon as unacceptable to a movement founded on respect for modern, positivist science. Under the influence of the Hussite tradition, present-day scientific and philosophical criticism of the church, and a group of "modernists" in the church, a group of younger Roman Catholic priests arose in opposition to the high aristocratic hierarchy; but their influence upon the general situation was slight. No compromise between the social democrats and church seemed possible.

The clash was, however, moderated by two factors. Adherence to Roman Catholicism was, and is still in great part, only formal. One is Roman Catholic because one has not yet left the church. On the other hand, the social democrats met the determination of many of their members to remain in the church by a formal declaration that religion is to be considered a private affair for everybody, so that the members of the party could remain in the church, though officially the party was in opposition to the church and Christianity.

In the first years after the war the fight between the church and the socialists was very hot. At that time a strong movement to leave the Roman church began and was energetically aided by the social democrats. Naturally the party also fought the holding of great land properties by the church—sometimes with, sometimes without, success. But in general the Roman Catholic church successfully resisted the attack. To-day the fight is over, but mistrust remains on both sides. There are many social democrats in the country to-day who reject the radical fight on religion. They would gladly accept a "new," free, scientific religion, especially if it were without any church obligation. Some of them would not oppose some kind of liberal Protestantism.

The cautious standpoint of the Belgian socialist leader Vandervelde and the positive relation to the church of MacDonald have made an impression in our country. The discussion of the Austrian social democrats' relation to free thought, which took place last year in Linz, was significant. Very important, also, has been the influence of President Masaryk's philosophy upon the social democratic view of religion. Masaryk has always opposed Marxism but supported the labor movement. He opposed the reactionary politics of the church but recommended religion strongly, that is, a free Christianity. Masaryk's fight against the church and religion is to-day the program of the majority of our intelligentsia. The writer of this article feels that Masaryk's ideas ought to be adapted to the new situation. The churches are not measuring up in understanding and helping the poor. Notwithstanding this, Christianity is the only true religion and there is no Christianity outside the churches. Here is the point of their difficulty, and there is another still deeper one: the social democrats (as the whole modern world tends to do) sees the economic question as the central problem of this time. Christ teaches, however, that the root of evil is in the soul. How reconcile these opposite standpoints and not hurt the labor movement? Further, in case the socialists should take an attitude of loyalty to the churches, deep political and social discrepancies would remain. The socialists are naturally for the separation of church and state. Our churches, Catholic as well as Protestant and Czechoslovak, oppose this. The socialists are for a state school system, a lay school. The churches, and not the Catholic only, support church schools. In general the socialists will remain progressive political parties; the churches in general support a

conservative policy. Coöperation between the church and socialism therefore appears impossible, and there has been and is no prominent man in the country who believes in its possibility.

In general, the majority of the social democrats still hold the fogged idea that any religion is reactionary "clericalism." Notwithstanding this, about sixty percent are supposed to be members of the Roman Catholic church. A combination of religious neutrality and opposition to the political program of our Roman Catholics is the most probable line of development for our social democracy.

The relation of the second socialist party in Czechoslovakia, the "Czechoslovak socialists," toward the church is different in theory, but similar in practice. Their members are recruited mostly from among the small bourgeoisie (small officers, artisans, et cetera) and rely more on the impulses of the heart than upon an elaborated theory. They are patriotic by program. They have fought Roman Catholicism as being international, thus against the spirit and interests of our nationality. Has not the church burnt John Huss, our national hero? Have they not helped the Habsburgs to re-Catholicize our Protestant country by force? Has not the church been an instrument of Germanization? Have not the high hierarchs been German aristocrats? Such arguments have had their influence upon the membership of this party. It is supposed that the majority of the new "Czechoslovak church" members are organized in this socialistic party.

The Czechoslovak socialists are undergoing a deep change, too. Enthusiasm for Hussitism is the basis for a sympathetic attitude toward Christianity. If they oppose Roman Catholicism it is more an opposition

against it as a "foreign" religion than against its Christian content. Prominent leaders of this party have declared themselves for the Protestant church.

In general, a new relation between the church and labor is arising. Fighters on both sides seem to be tired; though not laying down their old hostilities, they feel the great battle is over. Rome pursues a more liberal policy toward political theories. There is slowly developing an understanding that Roman Catholics should not be identified with Roman Catholic political parties. Only the communists are now fighting for materialism and they are rapidly losing influence in the intellectual world. Other socialists seek for a new relation to spiritual questions. Is it hopeful for the future? Is it a sign of progress or of decay? One must not be too optimistic. The characteristic of our time is fatigue. People no more believe in Marx, but they have lost their belief in Jesus Christ, too. Every deeper programmatical idea, every spiritual question, is suspected in this time of relativism and economization, as pure phantasy. The churches are more helpless than before. Is it labor who is to find the true meaning of salvation?

LABOR AND CHURCH IN MEXICO

ROBERTO HABERMAN

Roberto Haberman, General Delegate of the Mexican Federation of Labor in the United States, has had something of an international career. Born in Yassy, Rumania, in 1883, he came as a young man to the United States, where for three years he served in the Medical Department of the United States Army. After leaving the service he studied at New York University, taking his degree in science. He then entered upon the study of law at St. Lawrence University, and took his bar examination in California, where he practiced for some years.

Mr. Haberman had already become keenly interested in the Labor and Coöperative Movements, and in 1918 went to Yucatan where for two years he was engaged in organizing Consumers' and Producers' Coöperatives. He was then called to Mexico City, where he was chief of the Department of Foreign Languages in the Ministry of Education. While in Mexico City he was one of the founders and directors of the School of Social Science, and became an active member of the Mexican Labor Party. He was sent as a delegate to numerous Labor and Socialist conventions, and in 1924, when President Calles formed the first Labor government in the Western Hemisphere, he was sent to the United States as special commissioner of the Department of Industry, Commerce, and Labor.

On the first of August, 1926, a mammoth parade of peasants and workers—nearly two millions in all—marched the length and breadth of Mexico. They were the members of the Confederacion Regional Obrera Mexicana, the Mexican Federation of Labor, or the CROM, as it is generally called. They carried thousands of banners—banners proclaiming the loyalty of the workers to the revolutionary principles of President Calles and banners with Vivas to Christ the Carpenter, declaring that the workers were not attacking religion but the priests were attacking the rights of the workers.

The years of rebellion of the Church against provisions of the Mexican Constitution were coming to a crisis. The clergy as a body went on strike. The many thousands of Catholic priests refused to obey the Constitutional law requiring them to register with the municipal authorities and therefore locked themselves out of their churches. This was an unparalleled event in history—a Roman Catholic country existing for twenty months without priests, except for the small number of Protestant clergymen who registered and had no further difficulties, and some forty-odd Catholic priests who registered and were permitted to return to their churches but were immediately excommunicated by the bishops.

At the same time, the bishops decreed a general boycott against theaters, movie houses, automobiles, and luxuries in general. This boycott included champagne and French wines but did not include *pulque,* a cheap drink made out of the Maguey plant—a drink that is destroying the people who live in the Central Mesa of Mexico. The producers and distributors of this drink are amongst the main supporters of the Church.

A dearth of priests, a threatened financial crisis due to the Church's boycott, and an imminent unemployment crisis due to the same cause! Result: instead of the revolution planned by the hierarchy, parades and festivities—and this from a people almost one hundred percent Roman Catholic.

To understand this phenomenon, it is necessary to review some of the more important facts of the history of Mexico. The seeds of the present-day controversy between the Government and the Church were sown on May 4, 1493, by Pope Alexander VI, in his famous bull, when he granted to the Kings of Castille in per-

petuity all the lands and PEOPLE THEREON, "newly discovered or to be discovered." Shortly after the discovery of Mexico, or "New Spain," by Cortes in 1519, the country was inundated with voracious adventurers and even more voracious clergy. These divided among themselves all the lands, mines, and Indians, and began fighting for supremacy—the Church coming out on top. There were a few notable exceptions among the early missionaries, such as Fray Bartolome de las Casas, who was, however, recalled to Spain because of his insistence on humanitarian treatment of the Indians.

The Inquisition came to Mexico in 1571. In 1574 we have the first *auto-da-fé,* when sixty-three victims were executed, five of them burned. Several thousand people had already been brought up for trial. Through the Inquisition, through special franchises to collect taxes, through forced tithes not only from the population but also from the municipal and colonial treasuries, it resulted that in less than one hundred years after the conquest of New Spain, "most of the processes of life, social, economic, moral and political, were in the hands of the Clericals. In the parishes, the priest was the chief arbiter of destinies, and the bishops and archbishops were frequently called upon to assume civil offices. Business, that is, merchandising, was often engaged in by them. . . . The power of the Church survived the decline of political power during the seventeenth century, becoming the great problem of the twentieth."

The power of the Church was put to a test in 1624 when there arose the first serious conflict between the Church and the State. The Church through its tithes collected enormous quantities of cereal, which it blessed

and sold for seed. And the Inquisition saw to it that no one planted any seeds but those blessed by the Church. In this way, the Church was able to establish a seed monopoly that was ruinous to the planters. Viceroy Marquis de Galvez, head of the State, tried to destroy this monopoly, with the result that he was removed from office by the King of Spain and had to run away to save his life.

Mexico has always been the land of revolutions, and will be until land is restored to the Indians and social justice is established. Ever since the Conquest and the first stealing of the Indians' lands and freedom, it has been easy for any leader to organize the Indians into fighting units under the promise of "Land and Liberty." The revolution for the independence of Mexico from Spain was fought by the Indians because they hated the Spain that had stolen their lands. This revolution was started in 1810 by Father Hidalgo, a Catholic priest of Indian origin, who went to battle carrying in his hand the banner of the Virgin of Guadalupe, the patron saint of Mexico. He was excommunicated and turned over to the secular arm and put to death. His place was taken by another priest, Father Morelos, who suffered the same fate. These Fathers of Mexican Independence stated publicly that the only way to found the Republic on a basis of peace was to confiscate lands and give them to the Indians. The Churih hierarchy, made up mainly of Spanish priests, fought hard against the independence of Mexico and yielded only when it became evident that the somewhat liberal government of Spain, in order to retain the colony of Mexico, was prepared to grant the Indians some freedom from priestly exactions and from the hold of the landlords.

This explains why we find in the first constitution of

the Republic of Mexico, that of 1821, a provision granting the Roman Catholic Church the special privileges which it had taken unto itself during the many years since the conquest—immunity from civil action and authority; trial of priest, monk, and nun by ecclesiastical authorities alone; maintenance of special police to enforce vows and collect tithes; and monopoly of education, beneficence, and censorship. The clergy was above all civil law. And from the moment of his birth to the day of his death and burial, the Mexican was a slave to the Church.

From 1821 to 1857, a liberal movement came to life in Mexico and great battles were fought between the State and the Church. In 1833, the Church was instrumental in bringing about the downfall of the president, Gomez Farias, who had dared the power of the Church by stopping the collection of tithes from the Federal Treasury and assailing the exemption of the Clergy from the jurisdiction of the civil courts. With the help of the clergy, Santa Ana then became dictator, and a very anti-liberal constitution was adopted, in 1836, reducing some of the democratic measures of the constitution of 1821. In 1843, another constitution was adopted, more anti-liberal still.

In 1847, during the invasion of Mexico by the United States, the Mexican government, faced with an empty treasury, forced from the Church a loan of fifteen million pesos (seven and a half million dollars) with interest at five percent. The Church resisted this loan and declared a "strike" of priests and a boycott similar to that of 1926. Finally, when the victorious American troops reached Puebla, the bishop there received and blessed them, and the Church raised triumphant arches in their honor.

By the year 1854, the Church had gained possession of about two-thirds of all the lands of Mexico, almost every bank, and every large business. The rest of the country was mortgaged to the Church. Then came the revolution of 1854, led by Benito Juarez. It culminated in the constitution of 1857, which secularized the schools and confiscated Church property. All the churches were nationalized, many of them were turned into schools, hospitals, and orphan asylums. Civil marriages were made obligatory. Pope Pius IX immediately issued a mandate against this constitution and called upon all Catholics of Mexico to disobey it.

Ever since then, the clergy has been fighting to regain its lost temporal power and wealth. It has been responsible for civil wars and for foreign intervention. Archbishop Labastida, for example, intrigued with Napoleon III and with the help of French bayonets brought an Austrian prince, Maximilian, to be Emperor of Mexico. Much shedding of blood followed. This foreign invasion ended only after the execution of Maximilian, in 1867. The reaction to this treachery was the adoption of the Laws of Reform in 1874, further limiting the rights of the Church hierarchy.

In 1876, Porfirio Diaz became president; and except for the interval from 1880 to 1884 he ruled the country for more than thirty years. It was expected that Diaz, who had fought under Juarez, would follow his anti-clerical and progressive measures. But after his second inauguration, in 1884, Diaz maintained himself in power by disregarding the constitution and permitting the Church to regain most of its lost privileges. And although Diaz was born in Oaxaca and was of Indian origin, he became so involved with foreign capitalists, to whom he gave away large portions of Mex-

ico, that he is commonly considered a "foreigner." His rule brought the industrial and peasant worker to an unbelievable state of degradation.

It was under Diaz' régime that the few remaining communal lands in the hands of pueblos were taken away. Also a law was passed decreeing that when a man owed another man money he had to pay it in specie or in work. If a debtor died, his children had to make payment, in specie or in work. Thus came into being the system called peonage—a system of exploitation of industrial and peasant workers that for cruelty and brutality is equaled only by that of the Congo.

The hacienda, or ranch, during the period of Diaz, as a general rule consisted of an enclosure with one gate and many low mud huts, each with a small opening through which the occupant could crawl in at night to sleep on a mud floor, covered with the same serape that served him as overcoat during the day. At the back was the large house of the hacendado, or of the foreman, and the Tienda de Raya, through which the workers were paid IN GOODS ONLY and by which they were kept perpetually in debt. Nearby were more big houses with Moorish arches buried in flowers, where the many priests, monks, and nuns lived, supported by the hacendadoes. Connected with these was the large church, blazing its tiled towers in the glorious sunshine. But not a single school or hospital or infirmary!

The church bells rang out at sunrise to call the peons out, with nothing more to eat than some tortillas and chile, to work all day long in the burning fields, until sunset when the church bells rang again to send them home to their mud huts. During their work they were beaten. On Sundays they were lashed and sent bleeding to Mass. After church they had to do *Faenas* (free

work) for the Church, in the name of some saint or other—either build a new church or do some special work for the priests. It is no wonder, then, that after the revolution against Diaz, in many places, as soon as the peons were told they were free, their first act was to climb up the church steeples and smash the bells. After that, they rushed inside the churches and destroyed the statues and paintings of the saints.

The condition of the industrial worker was just as bad. No organization of any kind was permitted. When a propagandist arose, he was executed or sent to the hemp fields of Yucatan or the dungeons of the island of Ulua. The last strike among the very few that took place during the Diaz régime—the one in Rio Blanco, Veracruz, a textile center, on January 7, 1907—Diaz put down by having the artillery shoot down from the hills right into the workers. So many were killed that their bodies had to be shipped on freight cars down to the port of Veracruz and dumped into the sea.

During this whole period of horror and exploitation, *not once* was the voice of the Church heard in behalf of the downtrodden. Illiteracy amounted to eighty-six percent. But the Church helped the further enslavement of the workers. There was not a church ceremony, birth, marriage, or death, that did not cost money. The worker had to borrow for each; and the more he borrowed, the more closely he riveted upon himself the chains of peonage.

"The reëlectionists were the Cientificos (the clique around Diaz), the Catholics, the rich conservative class in general. They were warmly supported by the sympathies of many self-interested foreigners." With this help, Diaz held the reins for thirty years.

When Madero came along in 1910 with his banner of

Land, Books, and Liberty and started the revolution which brought about the downfall of Diaz, the Church, organized politically as the Catholic Party, stored arms in its places of worship and used all its influence, religious and economic, to support the old régime. Nevertheless, after much bloodshed, Diaz was overthrown. Before Madero could do anything of importance toward the liberation of the proletariat, however, he and his vice-president, Pino Suarez, were assassinated by Victoriano Huerta. Huerta declared himself dictator and supported by "the federal army and the clerical and foreign groups," instituted an unprecedented period of assassination of political and workers' leaders.

After the defeat of Huerta, Carranza became president, and it was during his régime that the CROM was founded (1916) and the present constitution adopted (1917). Article 27 of the Constitution provides for the restitution and distribution of land to those who need it. Article 123 contains the most progressive labor code ever written in the statute books of any country. It establishes the eight-hour day, prohibits child labor, regulates the work of women, furnishes the right to unionize and to strike, forbids lockouts, prohibits injunctions, establishes courts of conciliation and arbitration, and makes other provisions for which the organized workers of the world have been fighting since time immemorial. Article 130 restates the laws against the Church, as contained in the Constitution of 1857 and the Laws of Reform of 1874.

After Carranza, Alvaro Obregon ruled for four years, and he was followed in turn by Plutarco Elias Calles. Schools, books, the restitution of land to almost every Indian in the country, coöperative stores and cooperative agricultural banks, roads, irrigation works,

sanitation—all testify to the fact that these men made good the promises of the Mexican revolution that began in 1910. There are at present about fifteen thousand city and rural public schools, as against four hundred in the last year of Diaz. Illiteracy has been reduced to about sixty percent.

In 1922, the Fascist movement made its appearance in Mexico, with René Capistran Garza, President of the League for Religious Liberty, the most powerful Catholic organization in Mexico, as one of its heads. The movement failed because the CROM, in its annual convention in the fall of that year, not only declared itself fighting for the economic freedom and the rights of the workers, but also set up the Nationalist cry of "Mexico for the Mexicans."

In December of that year, a new counter-revolution arose, led by Adolfo de la Huerta and backed by ambitious politicians and prominent Catholic Church leaders. In Guadalajara, Jalisco, the archbishop, Jimenez y Orozco, blessed the sword of the treacherous military leader of the rebellion, General Enrique Estrada. This rebellion was noted for its many executions of labor leaders, among them the great Felipe Carrillo, the liberator of the Maya slaves, governor of the state of Yucatan, president of the Socialist Party of the South East, and ex-secretary-treasurer of the CROM.

In April, 1922, the first Catholic Labor Convention was held, resulting in the formation of the National Catholic Federation of Labor, made up of priests, acolytes, and other Church addicts. Its express purpose was the "destroying of the red union called the CROM." This Catholic Federation never attained any strength or influence; its program for the betterment of a people earning an average of fifty cents daily

was the establishment of coöperative savings banks and the building of still more churches and cathedrals.

There are no organizations of capitalists to fight organized labor in Mexico, so the hacendadoes and industrialists use the Church. The high clergy has decreed that since God made man free, it is against God to belong to the CROM, therefore members of the CROM cannot be admitted to the benefits of the Church. Likewise, since the Church still thinks itself owner of the land which has been distributed to the Indians, the Indians receiving land from the State are declared thieves and are not admitted to Church benefits. The Indians felt these indirect excommunications a hardship at first; but remembering their years of peonage when the Church raised no finger or voice in their defense, they soon decided that they needed lands and unions more than they needed holy water.

The CROM, made up almost entirely of Catholics, published by the thousands a pamphlet announcing that the distribution, acceptance, and working of lands not only does not violate any of the precepts of the Holy Mother Church, but that it puts into actual practice the things for which "our Jesus Christ" died. The pamphlet was illustrated with a picture of a kind Jesus smiling upon an Indian who is plowing the land, with his wife walking alongside with a baby in her arms. Large posters of this picture were distributed throughout the Republic. In most places the Indians took down the old Christ and saints and put up this new-old concept of the Jesus who died for the poor and the downtrodden.

The present conflict started in February, 1926, when Archbishop Jose Mora del Rio, head of the Church in Mexico, issued a statement in the press declaring war against the Constitution. It happened that just at that

time the relations between Mexico and the United States were on the border-line of war because of the objection of the American oil interests to the land and oil laws contained in the Constitution and promulgated by Calles. Remembering the past performances of the clergy in allying itself with all sorts of foreign interests, the workers and their president believed that once more the Church was lining up with the enemies of the Republic and of the CROM, and the Government proceeded to enforce all the religious laws to the letter in a definite attempt to break up this state within a state. Foreign priests and nuns were expelled and no priest was permitted to perform ceremonies of any kind until he registered. The bishops, after receiving orders from the Pope, refused to register or to let the priests register, because by registering they would have to "recognize the power of the State over the Church" and the "Church recognizes only one authority, the Pope." The Church thought this would make the people revolt and overthrow the Calles government. Instead, the people went parading and picnicking, in accordance with the manifesto issued by the Executive Committee of the CROM, in June 1926, entitled "The Eternal Traitors of the Country."

The Church hierarchy, besides ordering a general strike of the priests, began throughout the world a most scurrilous campaign against Mexico, its government, and the CROM. The Knights of Columbus of the United States, in their convention in Philadelphia, August, 1926, besides boasting of spending millions of dollars in propaganda against Mexico, appointed a committee to call on President Coolidge and Secretary of State Kellogg asking for intervention in Mexico and the removal of the embargo against the shipping of arms

into Mexico—with the view either of initiating a war between this country and Mexico or of encouraging the outcrop of rebellions in Mexico. Since the beginning of the conflict with the clergy, there has been fighting in various parts of Mexico and the burning of trains and of railroad bridges. In April, 1927, with the cry of "Viva Cristo Rey" (Long live Christ the King), the official cry of the Church in Mexico, rebel bands, led by three priests, invaded the pueblo Juanocatlan and poured gasoline on fourteen Indians and set them on fire, because they had CROM membership cards on them. A few days later, they held up a train near Guadalajara and killed over one hundred and fifty people, then set fire to the train. Only a few months ago, the Bishop of Sonora, Mexico, was indicted in Tucson, Arizona, for violation of the neutrality laws of the United States in clandestinely shipping arms and ammunition into Mexico. And General Estrada, the man whose sword was blessed by the Archbishop of Guadalajara during the de la Huerta rebellion, is now serving a year's sentence in an American prison for a similar offense.

The Labor Party of Mexico is the political expression of the CROM. It was able to bring about the election of Calles as President, the first president on this hemisphere to be elected by organized labor. The CROM in its convention just before the inauguration of Calles as president, December, 1924, resolved by unanimous vote to place itself at the orders of Calles and to support him in all his acts. Calles appointed the head and founder of the Crom, Luis N. Morones, as secretary of Industry, Commerce and Labor. Many other CROM leaders were placed in responsible government positions. And in his annual message to Congress, Sep-

tember, 1926, President Calles informed Congress that the principles adopted by the government of the Republic were those of the workers. During the Calles régime the CROM attained its present strength.

The Catholic Party supported for the presidency the reactionary general, Angel Flores, and his anti-agrarian and anti-labor program.

The Mexican is by nature religious and mystic. But he cannot forget what the Church has done to him by allying itself with the hacendado, the factory-owner, and the foreign capitalist. In many parts of Mexico, where a stone or wooden cross is used as a milepost, the peon will not pass it without crossing himself, and if there are flowers growing in the surrounding fields, he will pick some and lay them on the cross. In almost every Mexican home one finds patron saints with candles burning before them. But the people living in these homes will not worship the same saints in a church. In one of the villages, a peasant, asked how he was getting along without priests, answered not only that he did not miss them but: "Do you know what the priests did? They took Jesus, who was one of us, a carpenter, and they made him a king."

LABOR AND CHURCH IN CHINA TO-DAY

GIDEON CHEN

Born in 1898 in a Christian family. His father, a medical man by profession, interested in social and religious work, was a devoted elder in the American Dutch Reformed Church at Shihma, near Amoy. Thus the son "inherited" social and religious interest from his father. He studied in Anglo-Chinese College, Fukien Christian University, and Yenching University in Peking, with special emphasis on history and social science. It was in Peking, during 1921-22, after experience in famine relief and the Student Movement, that his sense of duty toward the suffering masses in his own country was awakened. In collaboration with his literary friends in Peking, a weekly paper called *The New Society* was published to champion the cause of the common people. After three special numbers on Labor had been issued, the paper was closed down by the authorities. Another attempt to publish a monthly magazine called *Social Reconstruction* was also made impossible by the police.

After graduation from Yenching University he became an instructor of economics at the Anglo-Chinese College, Amoy, 1922-23, concerning himself occasionally with local social politics.

From 1923-25 Mr. Chen served the Industrial Committee of the National Christian Council, under the guidance of Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin, Miss Mary A. Dingman, and Miss Agatha Harrison. Two years, 1925-27, were spent abroad studying industrial history and labor problems in England, attending conferences like the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work in Stockholm, visiting several continental countries, Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, etc. Before going abroad, he acted as Chinese secretary to the Commission on Social Research, which involved four months extensive travel in China. Since returning home in August, 1927, he has become secretary of the Industrial Committee of the National Christian Council, in which capacity he has been engaged in stimulating interest among Christian forces in industrial matters, in producing industrial literature, and advising the Governments, both local and national, on labor legislation.

IT is exceedingly difficult for anyone at present to make any statement to friends overseas on the relation

between labour and church in China. In the midst of great changes occurring in the country from day to day, neither Chinese labour nor the indigenous church, which are both in the process of transformation, has quite found its footing. On the one hand, the infant Labour Movement has not yet produced any national figures or recognized leadership; labour organizations are still in a stage of flux, ups and downs following the political and military movements. On the other hand, the Christian Church in China, brought up in a Western greenhouse, with all its achievements and shortcomings, does not speak a language intelligible to the labour world. The gap between labour and the church in China is sarcastically summed up in a poem written by Mr. Tai Chi Tao, a prominent leader of the Kuomintang, for many years secretary to the late Dr. Sun Yat Sen. Some extracts are as follows:

The Pastor says: "Happiness of the flesh
Nothing to do with the soul.
Only work; only endure;
Hardship and suffering are the Will of God.
Don't resist, but obey;
Wait till you die,
When the angel will receive you!
Amen!"

From the Church to the factory
Twelve hours' work,
Twelve hours' sweating,
Two small dimes for two "chins" of rice.
This is the blessing of the Lord
Thank Him!
. . . In this glorious Shanghai!
Where many beautiful churches are seen,
But no resting place for the working men.

Again, a quotation from the pamphlet issued by the Anti-Christian Federation in Swatow, South China, reveals the same viewpoint:

> Why should the workers oppose Christianity? Workers! If you cease to work for one day, will God feed you? When you are oppressed by the capitalist, has God ever fought with you? Doesn't the help of Jesus amount to this: bear your hungry stomach, don't resist the capitalist, wait until you go to heaven? Isn't it clear that this helps the capitalist to oppress you? For your class interest, fight Christianity in the same spirit as you fight against the capitalist!

These sound rather harsh. Nevertheless, one thing is clear, that is, the ends of the church and labour in China have not yet met. In the spring of 1928 a simple questionnaire regarding the attitude of labour towards the church was sent to a number of people who are serving workers in one way or another. A Chinese woman who is a Christian social worker wrote thus: "I am sorry to say that I cannot have these questions answered for you. The workers with whom I am in touch do not know what the church is, still less have reflections about it." The reply received from an American friend in Hangchow contains this sentence: "There is no attitude of labour towards the church or Christian institutions." A young Christian student who is employed by the Shanghai Government Bureau of Agriculture, Labour and Commerce to help investigate trade unions and industrial disputes, reported: "The labour leaders know nothing about the church! Cannot answer your questionnaire."

The cases cited above show how the witnesses from different quarters agree on the ignorance of Chinese

labour as to what the church is. Now let the labourers speak for themselves. The questionnaire which was sent out to the labour organizers and trade-union officers contained a few simple questions on Church, Christ and Religion. Of the twenty-six returns, half of them either say they know nothing or too little to form any opinion. Some charge the church with the "crimes" of cultural invasion, with being the "running dog of imperialism," with imprisoning young men, and with being a hindrance to the progress of knowledge, et cetera. Those who favour the church speak of its merit in running schools and hospitals, and organizing benevolent work. If we classify the attitude of labour leaders towards the church into three classes, the stranger, the enemy and the friend, according to the facts given above, we can say none of them really understands the church. This, of course, represents only the organized factory workers; the small handicraft people may have a more favourable attitude towards the church.

The answers to the question, "What should the church do in order to serve labour in China?" may be grouped under three headings: (1) Seven say "don't know." (2) Seven refuse the service of the church on the ground that either the Kuomintang or the trade union can take care of the workers, therefore there is no place for the church. (3) Fourteen, or the majority, would welcome the help of the church in the education of labour; some specify the kind of education they want, as the Kuomintang's party education. Others insist that the control of education should be in the hands of trade unions, while the church should be responsible merely for the finance. This request of the Chinese labour leaders is rather significant. Here is the rising tide of the millions in China whose leaders are so eager

to have their fellow workers educated that they even turn to this mysterious and "imperialistic" church, of which they know very little, for educational help. Education, of course, is not the primary object for which the church exists. It is, however, a vital channel through which the church can influence the mind of labour. Their leaders have asked for it. What will be the church's answer?

We have seen something of the attitude of Chinese labour towards the church. What of Christ and religion? Of religion, only two out of the twenty-six say it is useless. Most of them recognize that the value of religion lies in the power of assisting people to be good or to do good. One says, "Religion gives comfort to life." Another puts it as spiritual comfort. With regard to Christ, one out of the twenty-six says, "He is a big fool in history." Eighteen answer, "Do not know Him," or "Have not studied Him." One put down, "I don't know these two persons, Jesus and Christ!" Among His six admirers, three mentioned His good personality; one said "the only Saviour"; another considered Him as the author of the Bible; the third remarked that His teaching "not to be ministered unto, but to minister" can be used as a maxim for revolutionary youth in China.

From the above, a number of questions naturally suggest themselves to our minds. Four main problems might be considered: (1) Why do Chinese workers know so little about the church and Christ? Who is responsible for it? The church? the worker? or both? If the high spire of the church fails to reach the low working class, let the preachers obey their Master's command, "Go unto the world," instead of saying, "Come to my church." On the other hand, since the

economic system in China so ties down the working man to drudgery from twelve to fourteen hours a day without rest on Sunday that he practically has no opportunity even to know what the church is, then the Christian conscience should be aroused to combat this system in order to let the workers have a chance for their spiritual development. Efforts have been made by Christian people in the Nanking Government and voluntary organizations like the Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A. and the National Christian Council towards this end.

(2) What kind of religion would be suitable for workers in China? The popular understanding of religion in China—Buddhism, Confucianism, Christianity, and other systems—can be reduced to this simple formula, "good heart and good conduct." If this interpretation is correct, it follows that any religion based upon institutional authority, or intellectual concepts, will be difficult for the rank and file of workers to grasp. Further, the minds of the ordinary workers in China are so full of superstition and symbolism that it is not an easy task for them to readjust their mental pictures to the Western Puritan Protestant viewpoint. What would seem to be needed for Chinese labour are Christian ethics and practical Christianity.

(3) What are the outstanding needs of labour in China to-day? Two things may be mentioned here. One is the rule of conduct, as I have just indicated. China is passing through a fundamental change in its social, political and economic life. The old moral standards are losing their influence. The new has not yet appeared. The worker is badly in need of guidance in his conduct, as partner in economic life, as citizen in political life, and as a member of the home, especially since so many conflicting ideas and ideals have

recently been broadcast. The other, as the leaders have explicitly requested, is education. They want to know more about the joy and truth in life. Any social or religious institution in China to-day cannot afford to ignore these two basic demands of the Chinese workers, if it is going to be of service to the people in this country.

(4) How present Christianity to Chinese labour? Sometimes the organized church in China seems overconcerned with its own problems and the fear arises that the slow movement of the church may not be able to meet the demand of the rapidly rising tide of labour. Perhaps a special Christian mission to labour is needed in China. No matter what form the organization should take, let it be remembered that the approach to Chinese labour should (1) seek to enrich the racial inheritance through enlarging what is good in it and supplementing what is weak or lacking; (2) deepen and quicken the spiritual life of the workers rather than impose opinions; (3) emphasize the unchristian and antichristian aspects of the economic practices in China and help to secure full justice to labour; (4) centre its message in the Christian way of life, individual as well as social. Give busy workers of China, a truer, freer and more abundant life. The ecclesiastical and theological problems can well be left in the hands of idle philosophers.

LABOR IS INDIFFERENT

KARL KAUTSKY

Karl Kautsky, one of the leading advocates of Socialism—altho since the World War considered a renegade by the Bolsheviks—comes of mixed heritage. His father, a scene painter, was of Czecho-Polish origin, while his mother, who was a novelist, came of an Italian-German family. Though born in Prague (1854), Kautsky was educated in Vienna, where his Czechish blood brought him into conflict with his school fellows.

As a student he was attracted to the writings of the English economists, Mill, Malthus, and Spencer, and to the works of the French Socialists. The events of the Paris Commune made a deep impression on him, and in 1875 he joined the Socialist Labor Movement, where he attached himself to the Left Wing.

In 1882 he was converted to Marxian Socialism, and in the following year founded the *Neue Zeit,* the first journal devoted to the spread of Marx's ideas. Prior to this German Socialism had been largely influenced by Lassalle, and Kautsky had much to do with converting it to Marxism. From 1884 to 1887 he lived in London where he worked in collaboration with Friederich Engels. During the next twenty years a steady stream of books and pamphlets came from his pen. His clear-cut logic, his lucid style, and his extensive knowledge in literary, historical, scientific as well as economic fields, combined to create a wide audience for his work, and did much to strengthen and spread Socialism and the international Labor Movement. His observation of the course of events after 1900 gradually convinced him that many of the predictions of Marx were erroneous, and in 1900 he broke with the majority Socialists and joined the Revisionists.

At the close of the war, in 1919, he was made secretary of state in the first German Revolutionary Government. He retained his membership in the shattered Second International, and headed a commission which worked out a program for a new unified party. Of late years he has written extensively against the theories of Communism and the Bolsheviks, and his book *The Labor Revolution* (1925) has had considerable influence on the development of post-war Socialist thought.

I SEE no way to deal with the Church in the abstract, as the different churches are very different things.

On the position of Socialism towards the Church in

the abstract, as a whole, I think there is only a negative answer possible. That does not mean that Labour is necessarily *hostile* to the Church; but it should be *indifferent* towards it, as long as it is not attacked by the Church.

Every workman and every Socialist may think for himself on the Church as a whole, and on the different churches, as he likes. He may be a true Christian or Jew or Mohammedan or atheist. But Labour or Socialism as a whole has no definite attitude towards the Church.

Religious men may become very useful and important members of the Labour movement, but the emancipation of Labour will never be the outcome of a Church movement, but the outcome of Labour's deep struggle. This struggle will be the more successful, the more Labour is united, the less it is split by races or churches.

We must not try to develop Socialism into a new religion or church. That would only create a new sect besides the numerous old ones and be a means of splitting Labour's unity.

The less Labour as a whole has to do with church questions, and the less it is interested in the churches, the more successful will be its strife for emancipation.

THE SOCIALIST ATTITUDE TOWARD THE CHURCH

OTTO BAUER

Otto Bauer was born in 1881 in Vienna. His father was chief director of a factory. He had every advantage which the prosperity of his family could give him. He graduated from the University of Vienna, and even in his student days he was active in the Social Democratic party and has been secretary of their group in the Austrian parliament since 1907. In 1908 he became associate director of the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*. In the same year he became state secretary of Foreign Affairs. In 1919 he was president of the Socialization Commission of the Austrian Assembly. He was the official delegate of the International Working Union of Socialist Parties to the Berlin conference in 1922.

Mr. Bauer is the author of nearly a score of volumes and pamphlets, the most recent of which is a book on the Austrian Revolution.

CAPITALISM forces the worker into the class struggle. In this class struggle he comes across the clergy and finds it the champion of his class adversary. The worker transfers his hate from the clergyman to religion itself, in whose name this clergyman is defending the social order of the middle classes.

Thus wide strata of proletarians renounce religion. They adopt the anti-religious philosophy of the period of the middle-class revolution and its civilization in its most revolutionary form—atheistic materialism. Free thought is developing and spreading among the industrial proletariat. Thus religion and free-thinking fight for the brain of the working man. The results of this fight vary in different countries.

In England, where the middle classes had already at the time of their revolution established churches and

sects against the state church, where the middle-class revolution had already in the seventeenth century attained freedom of creed and conscience for all Protestant denominations, there has sprung up a large number of Christian churches and sects on a Calvinistic and a Baptist basis. In the race for souls the churches were forced to adapt themselves to the mode of thinking and the spiritual needs of the working masses. So the proletariat met there with religious communities who had already adapted their Christianity to the mental needs of the worker. That is why un-Christian, anti-Christian free thought has not been able to take root within the English working masses: the workers' movement in England has never taken the stand of opposition to Christianity, but on the contrary it readily links itself to Christian ethics.

In Austria the bourgeois parties take advantage of the belief of hundreds of thousands of proletarians in a Lord in Heaven to keep them in subjection to their earthly masters.

That is the essence of modern clericalism. As Marx says, it changes "worldly questions into theological ones"—the class struggle between the middle classes and proletariat into a philosophical conflict between Christians and atheists. It makes religion a party question solely in order to keep the religiously inclined proletarians in the retinue of the bourgeois party.

Clericalism wants religion to be an affair of the bourgeois party, to use the religious faith of the masses to back up the power of the middle classes. "The mortgage which the peasant has on heavenly property guarantees the mortgage of the bourgeois on the farm," says Marx.

If the bourgeoisie must try to disguise the class strug-

gle, social democracy must disclose it in order to win over to the fighting ranks of the proletariat those who have been held in line by the religious disguise of the class struggle. If the bourgeoisie must convert "worldly questions into theological ones," the social democracy must reconvert theological questions into worldly ones. If the bourgeoisie must treat religion as a party matter in order to retain large masses of the proletariat within the ranks of their party, social democracy must treat religion as a private matter in order to have the entire proletariat unite in a joint class struggle.

There is an antagonism between dictatorial and democratic socialism: the former wants to incorporate in the party only the intellectually most advanced stratum of the proletariat, the party arrogating the control over the independent masses. The latter aims at a uniting of the entire proletariat; it wishes to see materialized in it the democratic self-determination of the proletariat as a whole.

It is from this principal antagonism that there ensues the different attitude of the two factions toward religion. The communists, who want to admit to their party only the intellectually most advanced strata of the working class, can keep away everyone who has not freed himself of religious fetters. The social democrats, whose aim it is to unite the entire proletariat in the party, can achieve this only by declaring the party affiliation to be independent of the religious views of the individual member: this can be done only when religion is treated as the private affair of the individual.

The church is a religious sanatorium. But at the same time the church is also a social power, which has become an ally of the bourgeoisie in the class struggle

of to-day. The religious worker is very much attached to his church as a religious sanatorium; but class interests, the class consciousness, of this same religious working man draw him very strongly to a social democracy, which is being passionately fought against by the church. The religious working man seeks and finds in the church satisfaction for his religious needs; but this religious working man gets into the class struggle against the middle classes and finds the church sides with this same bourgeoisie. It seems inevitable that this religion working man should get into a depressing conflict of conscience. The more we succeed in extricating religious workmen from the clutch of the bourgeois parties and in interesting them in our platform, the greater number of people there will be afflicted with such a suffering conscience. The remedy to free the religious workman from this torture is—the separation of church and state.

THE CHURCH IS WEIGHED AND FOUND WANTING

ERNEST H. BARKER

The General Secretary of the Australian Labor Party was born in Norfolk, England, in 1871. He spent most of his boyhood days at Sowerby Bridge, a manufacturing town in Yorkshire.

His father was an engine driver toiling at a low wage and the boy's educational advantages consisted of attending a primary school from ten years of age as a half-timer—half a day at school, and half a day in the factory—until at twelve he left school to enter the service of a grocer.

A term of employment in the finishing department of a woolen factory then preceded his entry into the engineering industry. After serving an apprenticeship in his home town he worked at his trade in Manchester and other towns until at the age of twenty-six he emigrated to Western Australia. In spite of his handicaps he had managed to take some work both at Russin College and Oxford.

Joining the Amalgamated Society of Engineers in Fremantle, he soon took an active interest in trade-union affairs, being appointed district secretary in 1908, which position he occupied while working as an engine fitter in the Government Railway Shops, until 1913, when he was appointed full-time organizer for the Engineers' Union. He acted as the advocate for the Union in the State Industrial Arbitration Court and soon attained a reputation for his ability and knowledge of industrial affairs. Especially was he keen in securing shorter working hours for the members of his union.

Success attended his efforts. Justice Higgins of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court granted the forty-four-hour-week to the Engineering Trades of Australia primarily as the result of the advocacy and work of Mr. Barker.

In 1924 the West Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party, which covers the industrial and political interests of the workers of the State, appointed Mr. Barker as general secretary.

THE attitude of the Labour Movement in Australia to the church is one of supreme indifference. There is little or no point of contact between the two and apparently neither considers the other in its activities and plan of campaign.

The mission of the church is to proclaim and practise the religion of Jesus, to support all efforts to establish righteousness, and to work for the time when "Thy Will be done in earth as it is done in Heaven" will become an accomplished fact. It is charged with the message to mankind of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The conditions and circumstances leading thereto or preventing its adoption are its responsibility.

What labour thinks of the church is governed by the efforts made and the success attained in its endeavour to fulfil that mission. Has the church tackled the job in a workman-like manner? Has it considered the factors which make for success and adopted them? Has it studied those factors which prevent success and endeavoured to remove them or nullify their influence? The answer to these questions will give some indication of what labour thinks of the church.

The worker's time is chiefly occupied in his daily toil, and his judgment of and consideration for the church depend to a great extent upon its interest and influence upon the primary facts of his life. Hair-splitting disquisitions on theological doctrines and theories leave him cold and listless.

He is not concerned with the differences of opinion between one sect or school of thought and another while the fundamental question of providing sustenance for himself and his dependents is looming before him as the most pressing problem of the day. He desires a chance for his wife and children to partake of the decencies and amenities of life and he naturally looks for the church's attitude on the struggle for existence.

The function of the church is to preach righteousness and the denunciation of evil and sin in whatever form

or guise it may present itself. It cannot escape its duty by a plea of neutrality in politics. Its aim is to bring heaven on earth, to make God's will paramount here. How can that be accomplished by an institution which proclaims its neutrality in the most vital affairs of every-day life and does not even take the trouble to understand the basic problems of the times.

The church preaches the brotherhood of man. What brotherhood can exist between the wealthy receiver of interest, profits, and rent and the struggling worker who sees his wife dragged down by poverty and overwork and his children stunted and dwarfed physically and intellectually—between the underworked and overfed commercial or industrial magnate and the underfed, overworked denizen of the slums?

Slums and mansions are no part of the scheme of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

His inquiry is met by the retort that the church cannot take sides in the political controversies and industrial struggles of the day. There is little reason to suspect the church of any great sympathy with the aspirations of the worker for a fuller and better life for himself and those dependent on him. The church contends it should not mix religion with politics, as it has adherents on both sides in any political or industrial controversy. The defence of this attitude would lead one to believe that the great problems of humanity are outside the scope and influence of religious thought and care. The Labour Movement is not antagonistic to Christianity, only to its expression and representation by the present-day church. It recognises its Founder as one of themselves. He was always on the side of the oppressed and exploited and the social rebel. He

would have experienced no difficulty in deciding whether to support the oppressed or the oppressor in an industrial upheaval. He taught the law of love as exemplified in the life of the family. He taught that God was the Universal Father, that all men were brothers, that the proper law governing the family life was love, not bickering and hatred, strife and enmity. He taught that the strong should not oppress, but serve, the weak. Love, service, and humility were to be the foundation of the Kingdom of God.

The Labour Movement is not a merely materialistic affair; it is mindful of the spiritual and cultural needs and aspirations of men, and while the capitalistic system stands in the way of their attainment the workers will have to wage war on capitalism and point to Socialism as the avenue leading to a fuller and more spiritual life for all. Socialism is a religion of manhood and womanhood, of sweetness and light, not merely an aim at economic theory and system, but an aspiration to a new and fuller life for all. It considers welfare of more importance than so-called wealth or mere hoarding of riches. It considers that the number of happy and healthy people is of vastly more importance than the number of millionaires in the community.

How can labour be expected to view with favour an institution founded upon such broad principles of justice and brotherhood as the church, but which pays no heed to the industrial and political questions of our time, concerning as they do the overwork and underpay of the toiler, the shortening of life by preventable industrial accidents and diseases?

The church is put on trial in the minds of men. They ask, "What did the church do when we sought a living

wage, shorter hours of work, safer working conditions, abolition of Sunday work, abolition of child labour?" The answer is an almost entirely negative one.

The few instances when church officials have helped are so conspicuous as to emphasise the general aloofness. The church's sole claim to existence is its mission to save the human race. So far it has failed; its only hope of success is to draw attention to the obstacles which impede the progress of this mission. Men cannot be made right until the material conditions of life are made right, and the material conditions will not be made right by appealing to the spoilers to share the spoils, but by making the spoiled so strong that they can no longer be robbed.

The church is charged with reconciling God and man, a task requiring a wide knowledge of sociology as well as an intimate acquaintance with theology.

Religion cannot be kept out of politics because it cannot be expressed except in terms of politics. David Harum's version of the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you think they will do to you, but do it first," of present-day business and commercial life is responsible for most of our present-day social problems.

Christianity concerns itself with human relationships and no Christian is justified in accepting those decencies and opportunities in life which he is not prepared to demand for his fellow men. The time has passed when we live to and for ourselves. The application of the Golden Rule is not to be accomplished individually; to be effective, it must be a collective application.

Only through politics can our aims be achieved. We want extermination of warfare, poverty, disease, ignorance, greed, prison, slums. These are all political aims to be achieved only by political means and

methods. Where is the churchman who does not desire the same? How can it be accomplished?

The church has wonderful possibilities and privileges and there is great scope for its activities in present-day life, with its great social problems, class war, international war, unemployment, poverty, preventable disease, which must end by evolution if violent revolution is to be avoided.

Every effort to solve these problems is met by the keenest opposition of vested interests. The church is seriously concerned with the evils of drink and gambling in their more blatant forms, evils which would not exist a day were it not for the spirit of greed and the support of vested interests. Where do we hear the church attack the root of the evil? It decries the drunkard and gambler, but not a word about the wealthy shareholder of the brewery or the stock exchange.

The actuating principle of modern business and commerce is competitive selfishness. The inevitable result is adulteration, bad and inartistic workmanship, unemployment for many, an impoverished manhood to others in return for their arduous labour. The principle which the Founder of the Christian faith inculcated was mutual beneficence and co-operation; the Christian faith is therefore opposed to the competitive system.

The church's reluctance to tackle the problems of everyday life prevents it taking its place as a leader of thought. It is reluctant to accept or countenance change in a world of change.

Recent discussions on the theory of evolution as exemplified at Dayton, U. S. A., and in the interference with the Bishop of Birmingham in St. Paul's Cathedral, stamp the church as being a long way behind modern thought. Discussions on hoary customs of worship and

doctrine to the exclusion of vital modern questions savours of offering a stone in response to a request for bread.

In how many of the advanced ideas of our time has the church taken the lead? Is it not renowned for being a long way in the rear rather than in the vanguard of progressive thought and action? It resents any challenge to its ideas, doctrines, or authority.

Carlyle, Ruskin, Darwin, Dickens, and other writers have contributed more to the world's progress in social affairs than the clerics of these days.

The workers of the world are pushing up their heads out of the morass of poverty and ignorance which has engulfed them for so long, asking those who have occupied the seats of power and learning "What are you doing up there? Is there room for us also?" It is a movement of those who have been suppressed and exploited, and on the answer given their questions will depend the future influence of the church. Will the church give them a hand and help to pull them up, or will it pass them by or even support active measure to keep them down?

Christianity needed Socialism. Socialism desired Christianity and its objective, and the dawn of the day when all men shall act as brothers will be hastened by the combined co-operation of Christians and Socialists.

SOCIALISTS AND RELIGION

EMILE VANDERVELDE

Emile Vandervelde, leader of the Belgian Labor Party, and since 1916 a minister of state, was born in Brussels in 1866. He studied in the University of Brussels where he had a brilliant career, specializing in law, sociology, and political economy. While still a student he joined the newly formed Belgian Labor Party, and in 1888, when he was twenty-two, founded the Association of Student Socialists. He rapidly emerged as the strongest figure in Belgian Socialism and was instrumental in launching the coöperative movement there. Meanwhile he continued his academic career, and became director of the Institute of Sociology, where he lectured regularly; and of the Art Department of the People's House in Brussels, which he helped to found.

In 1898 he entered Parliament and as leader of the Labor Party has participated in practically all the important debates of his time. Though still quite a young man he was already recognized as one of the leading exponents of Socialism and in 1900 became president of the international socialist organization, The Second International, a post which he held until 1918.

At the outbreak of the war M. Vandervelde threw in his lot with the government, and in 1916 became a minister without portfolio, and has since then been successively minister of Civil and Military Affairs, minister of Justice (when he made considerable reforms in the penal system), minister of Foreign Affairs, and vice president of the Council. He represented Belgium at the negotiations at Versailles and at various League of Nations conferences, and in 1922 went to Moscow to defend the Social Revolutionaries on trial there.

M. Vandervelde has never relinquished his academic interests, and in 1925 became a professor in the Free University of Brussels. He is a member also of the Belgian Royal Academy, and one of the leading Socialist writers. His works cover practically every phase of the Socialist movement, some of them being widely used as textbooks.

Two or three years after the war, the bureau of the Socialist International met in London. Our comrades of the Labor Party gave a lunch in our honor. Henderson, the future Minister of the Interior in the cabinet of MacDonald, presided. My neighbor was the

secretary of the French Socialist party, Dubreuilh, an old Blancist, impregnated with all the anti-clerical traditions of the French Revolution. As the meal was about to commence, Henderson rose from his seat for a moment and spoke a few words. "What is he saying?" asked Dubreuilh. "He was saying Grace." "No!" cried my French comrade; "it is impossible." And for a little I was afraid that he meant to leave the room.

If I recall this little anecdote, it is because it is characteristic of the totally different attitudes of the working and socialistic classes toward religion and the church to compare countries whose points of view are at the opposite extreme in England and the Anglo-Saxon countries in general, and France and to a lesser extent Belgium. In England the program of Labor is exclusively political or economic. Men of all confessions belong to the Socialist Party, though on the whole Catholics are rare, and the adherents of the Established Church manifest a preference for the Conservative Party.

In France, on the contrary, aside from a few Protestants such as Pastor Paul Passy (though he is, I believe, no longer affiliated), one may say that the Socialist Party is composed wholly of men who are indifferent to religion or hostile to it. The Catholic Church formally prohibits its members from joining the Socialist Party. The Encyclicals of Leo XIII as well as of Pius IX represent socialism as a "pest of the devil," as the systematic negation of all those principles which are at the base of the Christian society; while for their part the majority of socialists devote a considerable part of their energies to the struggle against the church and to propaganda against all religious authority.

The inevitable result of such a state of mind is that the organized working classes, instead of forming as in Great Britain a solid bloc, remain on religious grounds, divided against themselves both in trade unions and in politics. This is not of great importance in a country which like France has been "declericalized," where the believing workers are in an insignificant minority. But in Belguim, for example, or in Austria and the Catholic regions of Germany, where the Christian unions which oppose the unions with a socialistic tendency contain a by no means negligible number of workers, where divisions rest on a basis of creeds rather than of economic interest, such divisions assume great importance, as witness the Catholic Party in Belgium, the Center in Germany, and the "Christian Socialists" in Austria.

It is likewise natural that in these countries the socialist leaders, though themselves almost without exception positively opposed to all forms of religious belief, should have long made an effort to win over the Christian workers—in this case Catholic—to unite in unions and political parties with the majority of their class. They have tended, therefore, to leave religious questions to one side, applying to them the Marxist formula of the Erfurt Program: "Religion is a private matter" and "an affair of conscience." The party, as a party, has not concerned itself with the religious views of its adherents, whether they should be free-thinkers, Christians, Mohammedans, or Buddhists, so long as on questions of class struggle they formed a unit with other working men. They maintain that religion, being a private matter, should not also be a public matter, that there must be a separation of church from state, and that it is incumbent on them to resist any tendency of a church, let us say the Catholic church, to intervene on

behalf of the established order in the political and social conflict.

Even if one can accept the historical materialism of Marx without at the same time accepting the philosophic materialism from which it proceeds, one must admit that the majority of the Marxists see nothing more in religion than a simple reflection of economic conditions; and if they do not directly attack religion it is precisely because they believe the changes taking place in the economic order will bring about *ipso facto* correlative changes in the philosophic and religious order.

One should read, for example, the very interesting book recently published by the communist Bukharin, *The Theory of Historical Materialism.* The author who glories in being "an orthodox Marxist" "is one who allowed an old chapel in which for centuries people had made their devotions to remain at the entrance to the Red Square but placed on the wall facing it this dictum of Marx, 'Religion is the Opium of the People.' "

Such a state of mind is naturally far removed from that which seeks the possibility of reconciliation between the sentiments of religion and the aspirations of socialism in the temporal order.

However, in countries where Marxism is deeply rooted, its indifference to politico-religious questions and its constant preoccupation with economic factors has led many believing workers to enter socialist parties, or unions with socialist tendencies, because they are asked nothing about their religious affiliations, and their economic and social interests are well looked after.

A Belgian Catholic journal reminds us that today there are actually more practicing Catholics in the socialist unions than there are in those called Christian.

In consequence, though they are convinced socialists, any attempt to revive the old anti-clerical spirit or to mix socialism with free-thought propaganda, or to give precedence to such questions as secular education at the expense of social questions, purely so called, would probably call forth lively and effective opposition.

The whole subject remains therefore in the domain of tactics and opportunism, and the leaders of the European socialist parties may well be increasingly concerned not to offend the religious sentiments of their followers. It does not follow that individually they are in the least inclined towards a state of mind analogous to that of the labor leaders in the United States and England. Today as yesterday the immense majority are atheists, old-fashioned materialists, or at least agnostics, to whom it would never occur to profess any creed, no matter how liberal it might be.

It may be interesting to ask, nevertheless, if among certain socialists who used to be orthodox Marxists there is not discernible a tendency to break away from the exclusively economic emphasis of historical materialism, and to give a place to the sentiment of religion, not as a mere reflection of social conditions, but as a force which may act powerfully in the future on the social order.

Even before the war Jaurès' idealism inspired him with many ideas which might be called religious, using that word in the widest sense.

In the Introduction to my *Essays on Socialism* (Alcohol, Religion, and Art) I remarked that a careful examination of the thought of Marx discloses that he regards morals, law, religion, and philosophy not as mere "epiphenomena"—reflections without light and

without heat—nor as simply the products and by-products of economic activity; and in my essay on *Socialism and Religion,* dedicated to a former Catholic priest, the late Marcel Herbert, I arrive at the conclusion: "If one suppose a collectivist society in which class divisions will have disappeared, and in which the working men will finally be freed from all material and intellectual subjection; however important such a change would be, it would not prevent men in this state as in our present society from continuing to ask, What is death, What is life? . . . As long as there are beings who by their very nature are limited in their knowledge to the outward aspects of things, these questions will be asked. But while today the majority accept passively the solutions which one or another of the churches offers, everything points to the hope that in an emancipated society religion will free itself increasingly from the formal authority which is a reflection of our political and social conditions."

I purposely cite these lines, which were written in 1906, to show that this particular interpretation of Marxism is not new. But in later years there has been an increasing tendency to discount the fact of economic determinism.

Following the theme suggested in my essays, Mondolfo, in his great work on *Materialist History,* remarks that Marxian determinism does not exclude an idealism, all the more ardent and profound, because of the care to hide it; that every action of the proletariat as represented by the Communist Manifesto is aiming at the conquest of a human ideal of liberty and the development of personality, just as every argument in *Das Kapital* on the exploitation of the workers rests in the last analysis on the ideological

postulate that the appropriation of unearned increment by the capitalist is contrary to justice.

In a book whose title "Beyond Marxism" is in itself a program, our compatriot, Henri De Man, who was once one of the strictest and most intransigent of socialists, has come to oppose economic determinism with a strictly idealistic conception of socialism which finds its supreme symbolic expression in the desire for perfection embodied in Christian morality.

> In its truest sense socialism, though expressed in the dry language of social psychology, has aided millions of people to vanquish the complex of social inferiority. The socialist revaluation of the workers is a sublimated form of a natural resentment (as regards social injustice) which, without this safety valve, would result in exacerbated individual aggressiveness and destructive and nihilistic fury. In the language of religious ethics, socialism is a belief that raises men by lifting them out of themselves and turning them towards supra-individual ends, and gives them a hope which invites to action.

It is clear that such a conception of socialism would tend to emphasize the power of belief rather than the power of interest, and might result in a type of religious faith akin to that of a MacDonald or a Henderson. De Man was, if I am not mistaken, originally a Catholic. And many Catholics have turned to his book in the hope of finding there a return to faith. But I am not sure that this is possible. Nor am I sure to what measure this reaction against economic determinism will influence the new generation of socialists. But one thing is certain, and that is that as time passes members of European socialist parties will assert with greater energy than in the past their right to be at the same time Catholics and Socialists.

Does this mean that there will be a re-christianization of socialism in alignment with the old positive creeds? By no means. But it does mean that it will be easier for persons who are believers to become socialists, and it will open the way for that development envisaged by G. B. Shaw in his words: "We believe that our religion is in labor, that it is in reality not yet born again, but that our epoch is visibly pregnant."

RELIGION AND ECONOMICS

TOYOHIKO KAGAWA

Kagawa was born in Kobe, Japan, in 1888. After attending middle school he went to Tokio, where he studied at a Christian college. His father died when he was a small boy, but he was brought up by his cousin, in one of the wealthiest homes in Japan. Finally he became a Christian. This did not bother his relatives, as they did not care what a man believed. But when he decided to *practice* his religion, they delivered an ultimatum: "Choose between your family and your Church, between wealth and poverty." His choice left him penniless. He entered the Theological Seminary in Kobe, where he was given a bare pittance to live upon. His sacrificial spirit was indomitable. From six to seven every morning he preached to the criminals, before entering upon his daily studies at college. On Saturday evening he preached to the poor till late at night. At last he won six criminals. In order to keep them from their evil associates, he took a room in the heart of the worst slums of the city, that he might be their friend, and there he lived with them, gradually making more converts. This has since become a Christian settlement, growing up in the slums. Finally, in 1914 Kagawa went to Princeton University and Princeton Theological Seminary, where he received his B.D. degree. He also became a prominent labor leader and has been secretary of the Japan Labor Federation and on the executive committee of the Tenant Farmers' Union. He was nominated to represent the workers of Japan at the International Labor Conference. He helped to lead the strike at the Karasaki shipbuilding yards at Kobe, for which he was arrested but finally released. In philosophy he is a Guild Socialist. He has suffered for the cause, his life in the slums brought him trachoma which has almost cost him his eyesight and at present he can use only one eye. He has been in prison twice, fined three times, constantly accused falsely, several times of taking money from Russian Communists. His book, *Before the Dawn,* has had over 180,000 readers in Japan. All his money is given to the poor. He has recently become the founder of a lay order called the Friends of Jesus, whose fundamental principles are religious faith in Jesus, love of labor, purity, peace, and friendship to the poor. He runs two large settlements and is constantly organizing coöperatives, unions, and getting Christians into politics. His latest movement has as its goal the winning of a million souls for Christ in Japan. Although only forty years old, he has written more than forty books. There is probably no labor leader in the world to-day who more closely approaches St. Francis of Assisi, unless it is Gandhi of India.

Those who are possessed by the old ideas may have difficulty in understanding me. Many people find it of no use to think of labor inside of the church. The church is too holy to consider worldly things. On the other hand, labor considers the church too other-worldly. It thinks it has no concern with the interests of labor; and that the church has lost her aim in this world and is looking up only into heaven. And labor forgets where to go, loses its sense of direction. So labor stops thinking about religion, and religion stops thinking about industry. Religious people are praying all the time, and laborers are working all the time without prayer. In the medieval ages prayer and labor went together and there was no unemployment; and the law prohibited interest-taking. Labor was honored and life was artistic. But with the introduction of machines and scientific power, things changed completely. Life became tiresome, monotonous, and repetitive. Religion and labor became antagonistic. The materialistic socialism came to stand for labor, and the church tried to win labor back to religion. But the church has lost her authority to control labor. Throughout the world, strikes and social unrest, imperialistic wars and industrial revolution, threaten and torment the moral life of mankind. Decadence of morality and the spirit of anti-Christ prevail everywhere. Why so, may I ask? *The church has no principle of economics, and labor has no religious aspiration.* Marxists insist that religion is opium and religionists mock at the materialistic conception of history, and they consider that economics and religion are two different things. But for me, economics and religion are not two things but one. Both bear upon life. To develop life, economics and religion have appeared. Both deal with valuation. Both deal with

freedom. To make man more free, money and religion come into society. It is a great mistake to consider religion and economics two separate things.

They say that prices are fixed by demand and supply. Demand and supply are two psychological phenomena. Demand comes from desire; supply from labor. And more and more when man develops into higher stages labor becomes a more psychological activity. Desire and labor are two fundamental functions in life. And commodity is nothing but the crystallized response to stimuli. I want to analyze the laws of economics from the psychological point of view. It is a great mistake for labor to think of its function only from the mechanical and materialistic point of view. Machines are nothing but the evolution of the human hand. The human personality has purpose, will, a soul—in short, is of infinite worth. Not all labor is holy. Brewers, tobacco manufacturers, et cetera, are not using their labor for the benefit of mankind. More and more as natural power comes to be employed—electric power, steam power, mechanical power—it has become possible to utilize our surplus energy, thus released, in culture-seeking. So the world of laissez faire appeared, seeking pleasure from sight, from tunes, from smelling, from taste, from sex stimuli, from sports, from jewelry, from magazines, from newspapers, from schools, and from art. Modern economics is departing from commodity economics to occupational or vocational economics. In the big cities, man himself is the commodity for the crystallized response to stimuli. Actors, musicians, journalists, painters, clerks, teachers, engineers, clergymen, conductors, chauffeurs, cooks, professional athletes, and prostitutes are valued more than material commodities. But they amount to the same thing.

They are nothing but the crystallized stimuli to sensations and ideas of life. Because men are seeking more the inner psychological stimuli than the outward stimuli, they are passing from commodity to occupational and vocational systems of economics. And this change has given to labor a higher position and a higher value than anything else.

But with the development of intellectual civilization the growth of human society has made the rate of growth so rapid that the problems of interest and of profit-taking have become very significant. So everybody has begun to consider the rate of growth. Landowners and everyone else have begun to think in terms of growth, and have begun to measure growth by means of money, which signifies or symbolizes social power. Therefore labor, efficiency, legislation, and culture have been projected to the sphere of growth. And people have begun to consider everything according to this category. From this error there came the collapse of the capitalists, who are the representative men of this type who measure things by money power. But we cannot blame the capitalists exclusively. Everybody who measures value in terms of the rate of growth of material power is usually of the same type.

I am considering a new principle of economics. We are not any longer satisfied with the Manchester orthodox "political economy," or with Marxian economics, either. Religion has a great function in economics, and ethical force is a factor which controls business. But up to the present time no principle has been suggested because people lack the power to analyze economics from the psychological point of view. In the evolution of life, and to bring out the purposiveness of life, five functions are necessary:

(1) Power to realize purpose
(2) Selection—to choose the right principle
(3) Growth to approach the goal
(4) Law-abidingness (in the physical, psychological and social world) in the realization of life
(5) Life-aim

(1) *Power* is the basic element of life. Man power, natural power, scientific power, mechanical power, and, most of all, intellectual power are the basic elements in the evolution of human society. When the population is very small, men are contented with this sphere, working each for himself, sowing and reaping and harvesting for himself.

(2) The next stage is that of *growth*—growth of society, growth of man. Land-owners consider rent, capitalists consider interest and profit, rulers consider taxation, and the laborer thinks about increasing his wages.

(3) The third stage is that of *efficiency*. Here division of labor comes in, and musicians and actors divide their professions; teachers and engineers go in different ways. Big cities are built for beehives of these men of efficiency. A big city is the organization of the suppliers of stimuli. The city life becomes a melting pot of stimuli—jazz bands and chauffeurs, cafés and cinemas.

(4) The fourth stage is the sphere of legislation. Land-owners insist on surface right, capitalists on property right, inventors on patent rights, and the government on tariff and taxation. Legislation controls all the antagonistic forces which emerge from the psychological stimuli.

(5) But last of all, men never forget their life-purpose. Man wants to climb up higher. Some remain low. Some seek science, some art, some philosophy,

some contemplation; some seek after abstract things, some after expression of life. I want to call this fifth stage the stage of culture.

When social power becomes abundant and sufficient to climb up to a higher stage, surplus power is used for the seeking of more diverse stimuli. And some lose restraint. Competition and anarchism in industry are inevitable. Waste of life and energy is the result, because they lack restraint. In the medieval age there were *types* of desire and labor, because they knew restraint and self-control. They knew how to cut off unnecessary desires, and that was religion. The most necessary thing in the life of man is to set a type of desire, in life and in demand. When religion had function and power in life, to constrain and control the types of desire and labor, the danger of laissez faire of stimuli was not so great as in modern life. Modern civilized life is like nothing so much as fireworks. Everybody goes after stimuli. It is explosive and bomblike, but too expensive. What we need is really to set man on the right path to evolve in higher being, make himself freer, and rise into the state of self-existence, of nearness to God (what John speaks of as eternal life) —the life of the Absolute. If we would not use our lives so wastefully, and would restrain ourselves from impulsive and bomblike fireworks, then we should be able to use the surplus energy thus conserved in the most beneficial ways, to evolve in man a type of saint and angel. And this is the way of religion and the purpose of religion. Because religion lost the control inside of man, in desire and in labor, punishment came through the laissez faire type and we call it "worldly," which is nothing but phenomenalism and vanity fair. Therefore what we need is to get the fundamental religion and set

as the new type of man the type of the Son of God. Without this, capital and labor in the sense of laissez faire or Marxism are useless.

But there is no religion apart from life. If the profession of the clergyman becomes only that of a stimuli-giver, even though reënforced by music, reading, and religious history, the influence of religion will be weakened. And the power-givers or manual laborers will become superior to the clergymen because the former are nearer to life. The laborer mocks at the clergyman as a sucker of the blood of the laborers—because he sees men from the point of view of life. The difference between Jesus the Carpenter and the Pharisees was there; and the difference between church men and modern trade unions is there also. We must not make religion the mere fossils of stimuli. We must give the laborers a life-pattern and a purposiveness in life and push the lives of men farther up to the place of holiness and completion, abiding in eternity and departing from the phantom bubbles of life. The message of the church is there. Organize individuals into holier beings, into mutual aid, into social units, and into the life of mutual service and sacrifice, and so bring all those who are handicaped to a state of completion, a friendly brotherhood of all.

Date Due

HD
6338 Davis.
D29
Labor speaks for itself on religion.
66394

DATE	ISSUED TO
OCT 6 1948	Ken Smith
5 1949	Locke